



Includes the very scarce  
(Keeble) "Hymns of Consideration  
"On Eucharistic Adoration  
 pamphlets by Keeble.  
1876

262



THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES



Nov 1901

85





Contract. Head of Consideration & our  
works can. 1845

Evangelical Adoration. 1837

The state & its relation with the church 1839

Ed. by L. L. L.

1839

Lecture on Primitive Traditions 1836.

Tract No 78. Catechism. 1837

HEADS OF CONSIDERATION,

*&c. &c.*



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# HEADS OF CONSIDERATION

ON THE

CASE OF MR. WARD.

BY THE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M. A.,

LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

OXFORD,  
JOHN HENRY PARKER;  
LONDON, RIVINGTONS.

MDCCCXLV.

RECEIVED 200 20 0000

RECEIVED 200 20 0000

RECEIVED 200 20 0000

RECEIVED 200 20 0000

RECEIVED 200 20 0000

OXFORD: PRINTED BY L. SHRIMPTON.

## HEADS OF CONSIDERATION,

&c.

---

THERE appear to be three questions which Members of Convocation have to answer for themselves, in order to determine what course they should take in respect both of the charge and sentence, to be proposed on the 13th of February.

1. “*Is it expedient to entertain the question at all?*”
2. “*Is Mr. Ward proved guilty of that which he is charged with, by the passages alleged in the charge?*”
3. “*Supposing him guilty, is it legal, or otherwise desirable, to affirm the sentence of degradation?*”

To some, perhaps, an additional question may occur, between the second and third as here stated; viz. “Is he proved guilty by other passages, or by the general tenor of his acknowledged writings?” But this question, I apprehend, is excluded by the wording of the charge itself: “That *the passages now read* are utterly inconsistent with the Articles,” &c. It is true that the special passages are not mentioned in the proposed vote of degradation itself: we are simply called on to affirm, that “the said W. G. Ward

has disintitiled himself to the rights and privileges conveyed by his degrees." But this second proposition must stand on the first, else it will be a sentence without specification of crime. And the first proposition again must stand on the alleged passages: for it were against all rules of judicial equity to bring in a verdict of guilty, not on the evidence adduced by the prosecutor, but on other supposed evidence, confined to our own breasts, and therefore impossible to be met and answered by the defendant. Plainly it will be our duty (as judges say to jurymen) to dismiss from our minds all extraneous matter, all that has not been both alleged and proved by those who prefer the charge. Should any Member of Convocation vote for Mr. Ward's degradation, upon any other ground than the very passages cited against him, he will be committing the same injustice, of which a jury would be guilty, who should convict a prisoner upon their own supposed knowledge of some other felonious act of his, not mentioned in the indictment.

It might be otherwise, had the measure proposed been simply a doctrinal censure, or declaration of want of confidence. But *bad faith* and *degradation* are such serious matters, and involve such heavy penalties, that the person so threatened is surely entitled to every protection and safeguard, which law and equity provide in analagous cases.

Leaving therefore out of consideration whatever else Mr. Ward may have written (except so far as it may be needed for interpretation of ambiguities or obscurities in the words actually quoted), we may confine ourselves to the three questions set down above, which between them seem practically to exhaust the subject.

I. The first of the three, *Is it expedient to entertain the*

*case at all?* is clearly a very relevant and a very important one. It is relevant and within our cognizance; for Convocation is not a court of justice, bound to dispose judicially of causes and persons regularly brought before it, although if we do try any cause, especially one involving such highly penal consequences, we are bound to guard ourselves by those rules which courts of justice find needful for their guidance. But in itself, as hardly need be stated, Convocation is a deliberative body, and may be likened, in such proceedings as the present, to the House of Commons debating a question of impeachment. No wonder, in such a debate, if many whose impressions are unfavourable to the accused person, should yet vote against penal proceedings, as judging them on the whole inequitable, or simply undesirable. And obviously in this case there are very grave reasons for quashing the proposition altogether, reasons quite independent of particular statements in theology, and apart from all question of Mr. Ward's guilt or innocence.

1. It is unnecessarily harsh and cruel, and also undignified on the part of the University, to blend with what is meant to be a grave ecclesiastical decision, and to put on record, the saying, That "the passages . . . are inconsistent . . . with the *good faith*," i. e. the honesty, of the person supposed to be in error.

2. The condemnation, if passed, will indirectly, and *pro tanto*, have the effect of a new Test: for it will affirm the following propositions to be so contained in the Articles as to exclude honest subscription on the part of any one denying them.

- a. That the English Reformation, *as a movement*, has claims on our sympathy and regard. (Neither of this, nor of any other of these sayings, is the *truth* here in question;

the only point is, *Are they palpably contained in the Articles?*)

β. That there was no great sin on the part of the English Church in our separation from Rome: no connivance at sacrilege, for example; no slighting of established authority and visible unity; no unworthy truckling to secular tyranny and injustice. What is there in the Articles about this, one way or the other?

γ. That the "spirit" of certain of the Articles is not contradictory to that of the Prayer-Book. For example, that the saying, "We are justified by faith only," has no appearance or air of contradiction to St. James ii. 24. (which the Prayer-Book orders to be read in Church three times a year) and to the last verse of the Creed of St. Athanasius.

δ. That the Reformers could not have intended so to frame the Articles, as to make it possible for Roman Catholics to sign them.

ε. That the 12th Article in particular may not be signed in any sense, but that which would naturally be given to it by a person versed in the controversies of the sixteenth century.

Of these five statements, three at least are obviously irrelevant to the substance of the Articles themselves.

Unless however we are prepared to affirm that no one, dissenting from any of these propositions, can honestly sign the Articles, we shall be voting against our own convictions in saying *Placet* to the first question; and if we do affirm it, we make (as far as one precedent goes) a virtual addition to the test of Church membership at present required by the University.

3. The proposed decree being in the nature of a *privilegium*, or law passed *ex post facto* for a particular case, is in its own nature invidious and unfair, and can only be

justified by great necessity, and strict impartiality in the enacting body. But both the necessity and the impartiality are in this case negatived by the palpable fact, that at this very time persons are allowed to go on unquestioned in the University, who take at least as great liberties with the five first Articles, and with the letter of the Prayer-Book, (the Baptismal and Ordination Services, and the Catechism,) as any one is now charged with respecting some of the later Articles. And the impartiality in particular is made questionable by this other obvious fact, that at the Board from which this censure proceeds sits one, of whom the University has declared her suspicion on the ground of his theological opinions, without his "good faith" being questioned, and without any proposal to degrade him. If the "Via Media" is to be defended by something like the sword of excommunication, at least it should be two-edged, and cut both ways. Indeed it seems highly scandalous, that any degree of what is called Romanizing should be visited more severely than heretical statements affecting the foundations of the Faith, the Trinity, and Incarnation.

4. It is very undesirable that the University should hastily depart from the regular traditional policy of this branch of the Church, which has always been to tolerate all who could subscribe the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense, enduring great latitude both on the right hand and on the left, while by her Canons and the voice of her greatest Divines, as well as by the spirit of her other Formularies, she has ever held up the consent of Antiquity as the best interpreter of what might be ambiguous in them.

5. It is especially uncharitable and unwise at present to narrow the ground of Anglicanism, and that on the side of Rome exclusively; both as increasing the relative

power of the Latitudinarian and Rationalistic schools which exist among us, and as adding force to any doubts, which may be reasonably or unreasonably felt concerning our Catholicity.

6. Nor ought it to be overlooked in this question of expediency, that in driving this writer and such as think with him out of our body, we are parting with a set of persons most willing and able, as large experience has shewn, to work within and under the Church of England in all charity, patience, and self-denial, against the common enemies of us all—vice and unbelief. All that has been and is said about bearing with unsound *Protestant* opinions, because of the practical excellency and usefulness of their maintainers, ought to tell, one should imagine, against harsh dealing in the present case.

7. On the other hand, valuable as their services are, they are so few in number, and so little likely to increase, that scarce any thing would be gained by excluding them. So painful a matter as a formal punishment ought not to be urged except of necessity, and for some great end. What is the great end in degrading Mr. Ward? Hardly one or two agree with him, in thinking all Roman doctrine compatible with the Thirty-nine Articles. This being so, the measure reduces itself to a mere unmeaning wanton attack, almost upon an individual. Others, who have been struck at, did at least represent a school: but can this be said in the present instance? Or will it be maintained that Convocation is an ordinary judge, to come forward whenever any private M.A. does wrong?

Here again one is tempted to long for a little impartiality. There has notoriously been for some time a School of Oxford Divines, maintaining (to speak plainly) Sabellian opinions. Why has no censure upon them been proposed?

The only excuse which suggests itself is, their being supposed few, and little likely to spread. I wish the supposition were correct: but being, as it is, the only creditable account of the omission to censure in that and in some other instances, it makes the present attempt appear the more inexcusably partial and one-sided.

I would put it most respectfully, but most earnestly, to those Members of Convocation especially, who for various reasons feel indignant toward Mr. Ward, whether on grounds like these it be not desirable that the proposed measure should be stopped *in limine*? whether, if it came before them as questions do in the Houses of Parliament, they would not be disposed to move the "previous question?"

II. In the next place we have to consider, how far the passages cited from "the *Ideal*" bear out the charge of "bad faith." If we do but think it *possible* that the error we may suppose contained in them may be attributed to obliquity of judgment, incautious reasoning, or anything else short of conscious and deliberate dishonesty, we are bound by every obligation of charity and justice to say *Non placet* to the charge.

On this head I submit as follows:—

1. No person who knows Mr. Ward believes him at all likely to be guilty of conscious and deliberate dishonesty: the mistake which his friends and acquaintance of all parties seem rather to dread on his part is what may be called excess of frankness: as though he thought it necessary to state his opinions at every possible disadvantage, and to shock as many persons as he can, lest he should seem hereafter to have beguiled them.

2. Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley have produced no small quantity of historical evidence to prove the admissibility in

the English Church, since the Reformation, of certain views more or less like their own : and those who do not think that their precedents quite bear them out, may yet easily understand how they might innocently and in "good faith" rely upon those precedents.

3. If after considering all this, people yet feel themselves constrained to pass so very severe a sentence, by parity of reasoning they must be prepared to denounce, as *dishonest*, the whole body of those who declare their adherence to the Prayer-Book, denying at the same time or explaining away the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism.

All that can be said against Mr. Ward of inventing "strange, incredible hypotheses," "going against the spirit of our Formularies," "breaking the letter of solemn engagements," "denying authority to the Church," and (in many cases) using language concerning her which sounds disrespectful—may be said at least as truly of the writers and preachers of the schools referred to : and all that can be said in their behalf, of high general character and usefulness, of seeming warrant for the liberties they take, to be found in other parts of our Formularies, or of the toleration shewn to them in various ages of the Church ;—may be said, with quite as much cogency, in behalf of Mr. Ward. If *his* words convict *him* of "bad faith," so do *theirs* convict *them* : if *their* pleadings may but be listened to, *his* ought not to be overruled.

And here it may not be superfluous, distinctly to call the attention of Members of Convocation to the real position in which they will stand on the 13th of February. It will be, I scruple not to say, an unpardonable mistake, if we allow ourselves to suppose that we come to affirm or deny an abstract opinion : to record our own adhesion to this or that school within the Church. Whatever may be

involved in the result, our direct business, that for which we shall be responsible, will be to try a Master of Arts and Clergyman on a special and defined charge. Whatever we may think of his opinions, however dangerous we may account his party,—unless we believe him guilty of the whole of that charge, still more unless we believe him guilty of the most stringent portion of it, the breach of “good faith,” we *cannot*, as the proposition is framed, *honestly affirm it*. And better it were to miss of a great good, than to obtain it by a mean so wicked as a dishonest verdict.

III. Suppose now, what I am most unwilling to imagine, the sentence of “bad faith” carried, a very material question remains: *Has the University power to degrade for such an offence?* We are not, many of us, lawyers enough to answer this; but it is understood to be matter of grave doubt, at least, among persons of high professional character, and not likely to be blinded in this case by sympathy with the accused. Is it dutiful and respectful to the University, to aid in committing her to a verdict, not unlikely to be hereafter annulled?

On this part of the subject, even persons incompetent as I am may be able to understand the following suggestions, for which I am indebted to an experienced legal friend.

We seem to be members of a great corporation: we have the power of conferring degrees, and these degrees are not merely titular or of value among ourselves; they are requisite for the enjoyment of many valuable rights and franchises, not only in Oxford but in the world at large. We have the power also of making bye-laws, or statutes, within certain limits, and of inflicting punishments for the breach of them: some of those punishments, but very few, involving degradation.

If Mr. Ward's offence, *as it stands in the charge*, supposing it proved and affirmed, is to subject him to this punishment, either our present statutes must point it out, or we must make a new statute for the purpose, or we must inflict it without authority of any statute.

Now, first, it is not pretended that any existing statute imposes this punishment for this offence.

In the next place, (setting aside the odiousness of an *ex post facto* law of punishment,) it is enough to say that the present proceeding does not affect to make a new statute. For the Hebdomadal Board, and the House of Convocation, are not alone competent to make a new statute. See Tit. x. s. 2. § 2.

Lastly, it would seem hardly maintainable that Convocation has a discretionary power of punishing, to the extent of degradation, in cases not provided for by statute. If it has, we live under this strange condition: that whatever the majority may vote to be a crime becomes so, and being so, the same majority may vote it punishable by the loss of a degree. This would be a new kind of law, I believe, for any other corporation. It surely behoves us all, of whatever party, to consider well, before we lend our help to introduce it among ourselves.

Even if the sentence were legal, there are circumstances attending this punishment of degradation, which would make us all most unwilling to inflict it, except in very extreme cases of deliberate moral guilt.

I have not felt myself at liberty to dwell here on the positive merits of the Author of the *Ideal* towards the Church of England, and many perplexed consciences within her, in respect both of large portions of that work, and of some former and more elementary publications: although

for both (amid serious disagreement from some of his principles, if I understand them rightly) I cannot but feel deeply grateful. Of course, to such as sympathize in this feeling, and appreciate also the many noble traits of character which Mr. Ward's writings disclose, it must be simply impossible to find him guilty of "bad faith;" or to think of his being degraded, without a deep sense of wrong and dread of retribution.

But judging of his case by those measures only which I have endeavoured to apply above, I can imagine few things more unfair and cruel in themselves, or more likely to be ruinous under our present circumstances, than his condemnation, should it unhappily be carried.

*Hursley, Jan. 16, 1845.*



ON  
EUCCHARISTICAL ADORATION.

BY THE  
REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.,  
VICAR OF HURSELEY

---

“It pleased God the Word to unite the created Flesh which is of Us without blemish unto Himself: therefore It is adored, with God the Word, inasmuch as He hath deified It.”—*Apost. ap. Chrys.*, ed Sav., vi. 962.

---

OXFORD,  
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON :  
JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER.  
M DCCC LVII.



It may be proper to state that the following pages were written before the writer had seen either "The Real Presence," by Dr. Pusey, "The Principles of Divine Service," vol. ii., by Mr. Freeman, or Mr. Carter's "Treatise on the Christian Priesthood."

V. O LORD JESUS CHRIST, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

R. Preserve us from being carried about with divers and strange doctrines.

Almighty, everliving FATHER, Who hast promised unto Thy faithful people life by Thine Incarnate Son, even as He liveth by Thee; Grant unto us all, and especially to our Bishops and Pastors, and to those whom Thy Providence hath in any wise entrusted with the treasure of Thy holy doctrine amongst us, Thy good SPIRIT, always so to believe and understand, to feel and firmly to hold, to speak and to think, concerning the Mystery of the Communion of Thy Son's Body and Blood, as shall be well-pleasing to Thee, and profitable to our souls; through the same our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the same SPIRIT, One God, world without end. *Amen.*

# ON EUCHARISTICAL ADORATION;

## OR, THE WORSHIP OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR IN THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY COMMUNION.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### PROMPTINGS OF NATURAL PIETY.

§. 1. THE object of this Essay is to allay, and, if possible, CHAP. I.  
to quiet, the troublesome thoughts which may at times, and  
now especially, occur to men's minds on this awful subject,  
so as even to disturb them in the highest act of devotion.  
For this purpose it may be well to consider calmly, not  
without deep reverence of heart, First, what Natural Piety  
would suggest; Secondly, what Holy Scripture may appear  
to sanction; Thirdly, what the Fathers and Liturgies indi-  
cate to have been the practice of the Primitive Church;  
Fourthly, what the Church of England enjoins and recom-  
mends.

§ 2. For the first: is it not self-evident that, had there  
been no abuse, or error, or extravagance connected with the  
practice, all persons believing and considering the Real Pre-  
sence of our Lord in Holy Communion, in whatever man-  
ner or degree, would in the same manner or degree find it  
impossible not to use special worship?—the inward worship,  
I mean, and adoration of the heart: for that, of course, is  
the main point in question; the posture and mode are se-  
condary and variable, and may and must admit of dispen-  
sation.

The simple circumstance of our Lord Christ declaring Him-  
self especially present would, one would think, be enough  
for this. Why do we bow our knees and pray on first enter-

CHAP. I. ing the Lord's house? Why do we feel that during all our continuance there we should be, as it were, prostrating our hearts before Him? Why is it well to breathe a short prayer when we begin reading our Bibles, and still as we read to recollect ourselves, and try to go on in the spirit of prayer? And so of other holy exercises: in proportion as they bring with them the sense of His peculiar presence, what can the believer do but adore? I firmly believe that all good Christians do so, in the Holy Sacrament most especially, whatever embarrassment many of them may unhappily have been taught to feel touching the precise mode of their adoration.

And this may well be one of the greatest consolations, in the sad controversies and misunderstandings among which our lot is cast. It is as impossible for devout faith, contemplating Christ in this Sacrament, not to adore Him, as it is for a loving mother, looking earnestly at her child, not to love it. The mother's consciousness of her love, and her outward manifestation of it, may vary; scruples, interruptions, bewilderments may occur; but there it is in her heart, you cannot suppress it. So must there be special adoration and worship in the heart of every one seriously believing a special, mysterious presence of Christ, God and man, expressed by the words, *This is My Body*.

§. 3. I say a *special* adoration and worship, over and above what a religious man feels upon every occasion which helps him to realize, what he always believes, that God is "about his path, and about his bed, and spieth out all his ways;" that in Him he "lives, and moves, and has his being." And this for very many mysterious and overpowering reasons. I will specify three, the most undeniable and irresistible. First, the *greatness* of the benefit offered; next, its being offered and brought home to each one *personally* and *individually*; thirdly, the deep *condescension* and *humiliation* on the part of Him who offers the benefit.

§. 4. When Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt, "they cried before him, Bow the knee." When Moses delivered the first message from God to the Israelites in Egypt, concerning their deliverance, and the second message, con-

cerning the Passover, "the people bowed their heads and worshipped." Would it not have been very strange, if, when the great promises were realized before their eyes, and they actually saw the token of the Lord's Presence, the fire coming down and consuming their first offering,—that fire which continued until it was quenched by their sins before the first captivity,—they had scrupled to own His Presence by like adoration? They did the same, and much more, when Aaron, for the first time after his consecration, "lifted up his hand toward the people and blessed them, . . . and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, *and fell on their faces*." There was no one at hand to say to them, "Take care: people will call it fire-worship." And just in the same way did they acknowledge the finishing of the old dispensation by the building of the Temple. When David had completed his preparations, he said to all the congregation, "Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king<sup>b</sup>." When, upon the day of consecration, "Solomon had made an end of praying, . . . and when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord." The outward act of worship was more lowly, and no doubt in religious hearts the inward adoration was deeper and more fervent, as the mighty blessing made its approach more manifest.

§. 5. So, and much more, in the Christian Church. If we kneel, and bow the knees of our hearts, to receive a blessing in the Name of the Most High from His earthly representatives, Father, Priest, or Bishop, how should we do other than adore and fall prostrate, inwardly at least, when the Son of Man gives His own appointed token that He is descending to bless us in His own mysterious way? And with what a blessing!—"the remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His

<sup>a</sup> Levit. ix. 22—24.<sup>b</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 20.

2 Chron. vii. 1. 3.

CHAP. I. Passion!" His Flesh, which is meat indeed, and His Blood, which is drink indeed! mutual indwelling between Him and us; we living by Him, as He by the Father! Surely these are gifts, at the very hearing of which, were an Angel to come and tell us of them for the first time, we could not choose but fall down and worship. And now it is no Angel, but the Lord of the Angels, incarnate, coming not only to promise, but actually to exhibit and confer them.

§. 6. Further, the Eucharist is our Saviour coming with these unutterable mysteries of blessing, coming with His glorified Humanity, coming by a peculiar presence of His own divine Person, *to impart Himself to each one of us separately*, to impart Himself as truly and as entirely as if there were not in the world any but that one to receive Him. And this also, namely, the bringing home of God's gifts to the particular individual person, has ever been felt by that person, in proportion to his faith, as a thrilling call for the most unreserved surrender that he could make of himself, his whole spirit, soul, and body: i. e. of the most unreserved Worship.

Look at the saints of God from the beginning. God made a covenant with Abraham, He promised to give him a son of Sarah, and both times Abraham "fell on his face<sup>d</sup>." His servant Eliezer "bowed the head and worshipped," when he found that he was miraculously guided to the person whom God had chosen to be Isaac's wife; and again, when her kinsmen had consented to the marriage<sup>e</sup>. God descended in the cloud on Mount Sinai, and stood with Moses on the mount, in token that he had found favour in His sight, and He knew him by name: Moses "made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped<sup>f</sup>."

The captain of the Lord's host appeared unto Joshua, and Joshua "fell on his face to the earth, and did worship<sup>g</sup>." The angel of the Lord went up in the flame of Manoah's altar, and Manoah and his wife looked on it, and "fell on their faces to the ground<sup>h</sup>." When young Samuel was solemnly "lent to the Lord," Eli performed a solemn act of adoration, and Hannah accompanied it with an adoring

<sup>d</sup> Gen. xvii. 3, 17.

<sup>g</sup> Josh. v. 14.

<sup>e</sup> Gen. xxiv. 26, 52.

<sup>h</sup> Judges xiii. 20.

<sup>f</sup> Exod. xxxiv. 8.

hymn<sup>i</sup>. The Shunamite, when her child had been raised by Elisha, “fell at his feet, and bowed herself to the ground<sup>k</sup>.” CHAP. I.

§. 7. If we go on to the New Testament, and take a few instances out of many, we shall still find that it is the *nearness* as well as the *greatness* of the blessing which prompts the special worship or thanksgiving. “Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should *come unto me*?” “*Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.*” The leper worshipped Him, saying, “Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And Jesus *put forth His hand and touched him.*” On His walking on the sea, and quieting the storm, after the miracle of the loaves, those who were in the ship came and worshipped Him; so did Jairus, so did the woman with the issue of blood: some of them before, some after the mercy received. So did the woman of Canaan; so the father of the demoniac, after the transfiguration; so the poor slave, overwhelmed with debt, in the parable of the unmerciful servant; so the mother of Zebedee’s children, asking the great wish of her heart; so the holy women, holding Him by the feet, when, being risen, *He met them, and said, All hail!* so the eleven, meeting Him *by appointment* in Galilee. So S. Peter, after the draught of fishes, “fell down at Jesus’ knees<sup>l</sup>,” the more overpowered by the greatness of the miracle, because of the nearness of Him who wrought it; coming into *his* boat, and directing *him* where and when to cast the net. So Magdalene, drawn to Him by His presence in the Pharisee’s house; so the grateful leper, turning round to Him before He was out of sight; and the eager, rich young man. So Zaccheus, at His coming into his house; so the blind man in S. John ix., “Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee . . . and he worshipped Him.” So S. Thomas, on His specially addressing him; (for invoking Him as his Lord and God was surely an act of worship); so Cornelius to S. Peter; so the jailor to S. Paul and Silas; so S. John to the Angel.

§. 8. But three cases there are, which bring out this law of devotion (so to call it) in a peculiar and very wonderful way.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 1.

<sup>k</sup> 2 Kings iv. 37. Cf. 2 Chron. xx. 18; Dan. ii. 19.

<sup>l</sup> S. Luke v. 8.

CHAP. I. To Mary of Bethany it was said, "The Master is come, and calleth for thee;" for thee in particular,—for thee by name: what else can Mary do but hasten and throw herself at Jesus' feet? Not so Martha, who had not been sent for. And again, either of the same holy woman, or of another very like her, we read, "Jesus said unto her, Mary:" it was *that*, His calling her *by name*, His coming to herself *personally* and *individually*, which had the thrilling effect upon her. She had heard before that He was risen,—she had heard of Him "by the hearing of the ear,"—but now she heard Him actually speaking, and speaking *to her*; and so her eye, which before only saw without resting on Him, came clearly to discern Him. It was the personal application to her by name which drove away for ever her melancholy dream that He was absent, and caused her to turn herself and cry out "My Master!" with an adoring voice and gesture, as the context shews; for the saying, "Touch Me not," implies an attempt on her part to embrace His knees, or hold Him by the feet, or some such action: and even if it had not been written, who could have doubted it?

And may we not here, too, remember that other Mary, her whom all generations shall call Blessed, when she not only saw and heard the Angel declaring the message of salvation to her, and to us all, but knew in herself that the Holy Ghost was come upon her, and the Power of the Highest overshadowing her, and that the Holy Thing that should be born of her was to be called the "Son of God?" What her feelings were we partly know by that hymn in which, as we may reverently believe, she even now joins with the Church continually: which hymn is surely as perfect an act of adoration as ever was performed on earth by any but her divine Son Himself. We know that her *Magnificat* begins with owning the Lord and God as *her* Saviour; with amazement that He had regarded "the lowliness of His hand-maiden;" that He had marked *her* out for a perpetual blessing, and had done to *her* great things. In respect of the Incarnation itself, then, it was not only the immensity of the Gift, but its inconceivably near approach also to the Receiver, which she was taught of the Holy Ghost adoringly

to acknowledge. Why or how should it be otherwise in re- CHAP. I.  
spect of that which divines have truly called "the extension  
of the Incarnation,"—the participation of the Incarnate One  
by His true members, in and through the spiritual eating  
and drinking of His present Body and Blood?

§. 9. Thus it would appear that God's holy Word from beginning to end abounds in examples to sanction those natural instincts of the devout and loving heart, which prompt to deeper and more intense adoration in proportion to the greatness of the gift, and the directness with which it comes straight to the receiver from Almighty God.

Now the gift in the Holy Eucharist is Christ Himself—all good gifts in one; and that in an immense, inconceivable degree. And how can we conceive even Power Almighty to bring it more closely and more directly home to each one of us, than when His Word commands and His Spirit enables us to receive Him as it were spiritual meat and drink? entering into and penetrating thoroughly the whole being of the renewed man, somewhat in the same way as the virtue of wholesome meat and drink diffuses itself through a healthful body: only, as we all know, with this great difference, (among others,)—that earthly meat and drink is taken up and changed into parts of our earthly frame, whereas the work of this heavenly nourishment is to transform our being into itself; to change us after His image, "from glory to glory," from the fainter to the more perfect brightness; until "our sinful bodies be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood; and we dwell evermore in Him, and He in us:" "we in Him," as members of "His mystical Body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people;" "He in us," by a real and unspeakable union with His divine Person, vouchsafed to us through a real and entirely spiritual participation of that Flesh and Blood which He took of our Father Adam through the Blessed Virgin Mary; wherewith He suffered on the Cross, wherewith also He now appears day and night before His Father in heaven for us. So that a holy man of our own Church was not afraid thus to write of this Sacrament:—

“By the way of nourishment and strength  
 Thou creep’st into my breast,  
 Making Thy way my rest,  
 And Thy small quantities my length,  
 Which spread their forces into every part,  
 Meeting sin’s force and art.

“Thy grace, which with these elements comes,  
 Knoweth the ready way,  
 And hath the privy key,  
 Opening the soul’s most subtle rooms <sup>m</sup>.”

§. 10. The sum is this. Renewed nature prompts the Christian, and Holy Scripture from beginning to end encourages him, to use special adoration to Almighty God at the receiving of any special gift;—adoration the more earnest and intense as the gift is greater, and the appropriation of it to the worshipper himself more entire and direct. So it is with all lesser, all partial gifts; how then should it not be so when we come to the very crown and fountain of all, that which comprehends all the rest in their highest possible excellency, and which is bestowed on each receiver by way of most unspeakable participation and union,—that gift which is God Himself, as well as having God for its Giver? “Christ in us,” not only Christ offered for us; a “divine nature” set before us, of which we are to be made “partakers.” Must we cease adoring when He comes not only as the Giver, but as the Gift; not only as the Priest, but as the Victim; not only as “the Master of the Feast,” but as “the Feast itself<sup>n</sup>?” Nay, but rather this very circumstance is a reason beyond all reasons for more direct and intense devotion.

§. 11. This brings us to the third circumstance, mentioned above as an obvious motive of adoration in the Holy Eucharist. For consider,—to take the lowest ground first,—when men are receiving a favour from a superior, is not a sense of his condescension a natural ingredient in their loving acknowledgments? and if there is any thing generous and

<sup>m</sup> G. Herbert’s *Remains*, p. 99, ed. 1826.

<sup>n</sup> Bp. Taylor, *Holy Living: Works*, iv. 310, Heber’s edition.

grateful in their hearts, do they not honour and revere him the more for every suffering, humiliation, debasement, indignity which he may have incurred in doing them good? and can they well endure to hide and repress their veneration for him? are they not the more bent on avowing it, the more they see him slighted by others, possibly on this very account, that he had not spared so to demean himself for their sake?

Caleb "stilled the people before Moses," when the spies were setting them against him<sup>o</sup>. Joshua was jealous for Moses' sake, when some appeared to be prophesying without commission from him<sup>p</sup>. It is plain that their loyalty to him was quickened by the reproach they saw him enduring. So all the dark feelings and speeches of the unhappy Saul concerning David, served but to settle Jonathan's heart in loving and honouring him more than ever. So Shimci's cursing David in his affliction kindled the zeal of his soldiers and servants.

And our Master, when He was with us in the flesh, more than once gave token of especial approbation and blessing to those who confessed Him the more unreservedly for the wrong that was done Him; as to the sinful woman, who, unconsciously or not, supplied the Pharisee's discourtesy by a washing, anointing, and salutation of her own; to Simon Peter, speaking out before the rest, to own as the words of eternal life those sayings about Holy Communion, which had just driven away many of the disciples in disgust; and very significantly to the man born blind, when he in dutiful and pious gratitude had stood up for Christ, his Restorer, against the Pharisees, and had incurred their scorn and hatred. "Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach us? and they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when He had found him, He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? he answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him<sup>q</sup>." The Pharisees' reviling of Christ, and

<sup>o</sup> Numbers xiii. 30.<sup>p</sup> Numbers xi. 28.<sup>q</sup> S. John ix. 31-38.

CHAP. I. of himself for Christ's sake, led him not only to belief, but to adoration.

And what shall we say of the Thief on the Cross? It may appear by the tenor of the sacred history, that the providential instrument of his conversion was the revilings of the crowd and of his fellow-malefactor,—in which he himself at first ignorantly joined,—so meekly and majestically borne by the holy Jesus. When he saw that, he perceived at once that “This Man hath done nothing amiss;” and he became the first to know and own Christ, “and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death.” The deep veneration he had conceived for our Lord, as for an innocent Man receiving the due reward of such wicked deeds as his own, was rewarded with an adoring faith in Him as Lord and Judge of the whole world, and he became the first example of those who should be saved by the blessed Cross. And beholding his Lord's glory through the veil of His extreme humiliation, and taught from above to understand that for that very humiliation's sake he was to surrender himself entirely to Christ,—to worship Him with all the powers of his soul,—he became also a pattern for all who would be worthy communicants. For what is that which we remember specially, and on which we fix our mind's eye in Holy Communion, but the same which he then saw with his bodily eyes?—the Body and Blood of Christ, i. e. Christ Himself, offered up by Himself for that thief and for each one of us? And if he worshipped, and was blessed, why not we?

We seem to have been drawn up unawares, by this enumeration of examples, from the contemplation of a high moral sentiment to that of a cardinal principle in the kingdom of heaven; for such undoubtedly has ever been the rule of acknowledging Christ's Incarnation, and all His condescensions and humiliations consequent upon it, by special and express acts of homage and worship, inward and outward, according to the time and occasion.

But this topic may better be referred to the second and

third heads of our proposed enquiry,—What are the more direct bearings of Holy Scripture, and ancient Church testimonies, on the practice of worshipping Christ in the Eucharist? CHAP. I.

## CHAPTER II.

### SUGGESTIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

§ 1. AFTER what has been alleged, it will not, I think, be assuming too much, if we turn to those passages of our Bibles which more immediately relate to the Eucharist and the great theological verities connected with it, in the expectation of finding the worship of Christ in that Sacrament rather enjoined than discouraged; seeing that therein are combined and concentrated, in a manner and degree past human imagining, the several reasons and occasions of special worship, such as, in minor instances, natural piety points them out to us, and as they are everywhere recognised by Holy Scripture and the Church. There is (1.) a peculiar Presence of the Most High; (2.) bringing with it an awful, an infinite blessing; (3.) appropriating it, moreover, to each one of us in a way inconceivably near and intimate; and (4.) with a measure of condescension and humiliation on His part, such as could not have entered into the heart of man to conceive. Surely if, notwithstanding all this, our Lord's will is that we should not so adore Him, we might expect to find somewhere a distinct prohibition of the practice. The *onus probandi* lies upon those who would restrain us. We may require them, in legal phrase, to "shew cause" from the Word of God, as understood always, everywhere, and by all, why we should do violence to so many instincts of our nature. As Bishop Taylor has taught us to ask, "If Christ be there, why are we not to worship?" I say again, According to all sound rules of argument, it is rather our right to call upon those who censure the practice to cite some text forbidding it, than it is theirs to call upon us for one expressly enjoining it.

It has been repeated over and over again, that neither our

CHAP. II. Lord, in the words of institution, nor S. Paul in his inspired comment on them, has said anything about worshipping Christ there present "under the form" (or "outward part") "of Bread and Wine;" and therefore, that to abstain from such worship is the safer way. "If it be not commanded, it is virtually forbidden." Perhaps the foregoing considerations may lead some to invert the argument, and say rather, "If not forbidden, it is virtually commanded."

I proceed to point out in Holy Scripture what appears to me a very strong additional argument for the practice,—a complete justification, even if it do not amount to an implicit recommendation of it.

§ 2. Carrying on the idea with which the former section ended, may we not say, that throughout Holy Scripture, as afterwards throughout the traditions of the Catholic Church, is discernible an evident anxiety (so to speak) to preserve, and encourage, and impress on all believers this portion especially of the sacred doctrine of the Incarnation, That "the Manhood is taken into God?" the human nature abiding in our Lord's Person, true and entire, from the very moment of His Incarnation; and thenceforth eternally receiving from the Divine Nature, to which it is inseparably united, all such properties and perfections as it might enjoy without losing its reality and ceasing to be human. The *manifestation*, indeed, of these properties and perfections,—the "Beams of Deity,"—restrained and enlarged themselves according to the exigencies of the marvellous work in progress, known only to the great Ruler thereof; but in deed and in truth the communication itself of the properties of the higher nature to the lower, (to use a comparatively late ecclesiastical term,) was complete within the limit above-mentioned, from the very moment that the Second Person of the Trinity became Man.

§ 3. With regard especially to that property to which the present enquiry relates,—the Epistle to the Hebrews expressly declares, "When He bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, (*εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην*,) He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him<sup>s</sup>." What is *εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην*?

<sup>s</sup> Heb. i. 5; from Ps. xcvii. 7, and Deut. xxxii. 43. LXX.

"Into the created and inhabited world:" (such is the constant use of the word in Holy Scripture). Therefore the saying, "Introducing the First-born into the world," literally means "causing Him to become one of the creatures, one of the inhabitants of the world which God had made;" as He describes Himself, "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God<sup>t</sup>;" or as the Holy Ghost describes Him by St. Paul, He is "the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature<sup>u</sup>;" "the First-born among many brethren<sup>v</sup>;" the First-born, not in time, but in rank, and in the counsel of God.

Of course, when our gracious Lord began to be of the number of God's creatures, i. e. at the time of His incarnation and birth, He began to be the First-born in this sense. To that moment, and to no other, we may with some confidence affirm, the Apostle carries us back,—as the prophet David, who a he by the Holy Ghost is interpreting, carries us forward,—in the words, "And let all the Angels of God worship Him." The prophecy we know was literally fulfilled: to the Hebrew Christians, to whom the Apostle was writing, it was matter of well-known history. At the very time that the blessed Virgin Mary brought forth her First-born Son, the Angel appeared to the shepherds with the good tidings of great joy; but the multitude of the heavenly host, with their full hymn of praise, did not appear until the words of deeper humiliation were added, "Ye shall find the Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger." A thing which has been often observed, and which is surely much to our present purpose: it has a doctrinal as well as a moral meaning. Read by the light which is thrown back upon it by the Apostle's saying to the Hebrews, it looks like a proclamation from the Great King, This is He whom I delight to honour, "worship Him all ye gods," all that is called God in heaven and in earth; let the highest of created beings adore Him with a special worship by reason of His unspeakable humiliation, now that He is made man, "wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger;" let them understand that on this day the Father of all by the

<sup>t</sup> Rev. ii. 14.<sup>u</sup> Coloss. i. 15.<sup>v</sup> Rom. viii. 29.

Holy Ghost hath become the Father of the Man Christ Jesus, in that sense in which Christ vouchsafes to be "the Beginning, the First-born of every creature;" in that sense in which it is said to Him, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." God never said so to any of the Angels, but He said it to Christ, when He "glorified Him to become an High-priest;" anointing the human nature that was in Christ with the Holy Ghost, without stint or measure. That was at the moment of His Incarnation, for from that moment it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell—"all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." To that, and not to anything added by the Holy Ghost which had just descended upon Him, the word spoken from heaven at His baptism evidently refers: "Thou art My beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased."

So also, I venture to think, does the quotation of S. Paul in Acts xiii. 33; although our translation would seem rather to connect it with the resurrection: "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus, [*ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν*]: as it is also written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee.'" That this, not "raised up *again*," is here the more natural rendering of the word *ἀναστήσας*, may appear from the texts cited below<sup>a</sup>. The leading idea seems to be that of "*raising up a seed* unto David to sit on his throne," and also (as in the text last cited below), to be a Priest as well as a King. And this will account for the repetition of the word with *express* reference to the resurrection in the following verse: "As concerning that *He raised Him from the dead*, now no more to return to corruption, He saith on this wise, 'I will give you the sure mercies of David.'" *That* is the decree, the law, which the Father in the second Psalm declares, and the Son in the fortieth Psalm accepts "in the midst of His heart." Henceforth for ever the Son

<sup>a</sup> Heb. v. 5.<sup>b</sup> S. John iii. 34.<sup>c</sup> Deut. xviii. 15; 2 Sam. vii. 12;

Jer. xxiii. 5; Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Acts ii. 30; S. Matth. xxii. 24; Rom. xv. 12, from Isaiah xi. 10; Heb. vii. 11.

is made perfect Man, and as Man is to be adored with special CHAP. II.  
adoration by all the Angels of heaven.

§. 4. Observe again, according to this interpretation, the deep significance of that which is written by two Evangelists out of three in their report of our Lord's temptation. In S. Matthew we read, "The devil leaveth Him, and behold Angels came and ministered unto Him." But in S. Mark, from the condensation of the narrative, the lesson of adoration is brought out in a still more striking manner: "There came a Voice from Heaven, saying, Thou art My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And immediately the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness. And He was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the Angels ministered unto Him<sup>b</sup>."

There is a mysterious correspondence, if I mistake not, between the order of these events and of those which happened on Christmas night. First, in both cases alike, Angels and men are called upon to take notice that the human presence of our Lord is the presence of the Only-begotten Son: with this difference, however, that at Bethlehem it was the actual Incarnation of the Word, His taking to Himself a *natural* body; by the river Jordan, it was His taking to Himself His *mystical* body, typified in His baptism, to which the Voice from the excellent glory referred. So we are instructed by one of the earliest fathers, S. Clement of Alexandria: "Unto the Lord at His baptism sounded out from heaven a Voice, the Witness to the Beloved, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.' . . . Whether these people will or no, must they not confess that the perfect Word, Offspring of the perfect Father, was perfectly regenerated by *way of economy and prefiguration*? . . . Now this same happens also to us, of whom our Lord became the representation. In baptism we are illuminated, in illumination adopted, in adoption perfected, in perfection immortalized. His word is, 'I said, ye are gods, and children of the Highest, all of you.'<sup>c</sup>" Angelical service follows in both, but in neither immediately. The hymn of congratulation at our Lord's birth, and the lowly ministry and homage after the

<sup>b</sup> S. Mark i. 11-13.

<sup>c</sup> Prolog. i. 25, 26.

CHAP. II. proclamation at His baptism, (the former of which we know was accompanied with adoration; and how can we doubt it concerning the other?) were each of them reserved, as it were, until His mysterious humiliation had been announced by additional circumstances. The multitude of the heavenly host did not sing *Gloria in Excelsis* until they had heard of the swaddling bands and the manger; the Angels did not come and minister unto Him who was declared the only-begotten and beloved Son until He had been cast out into the wilderness, had abode there forty days fasting, with no companions but the wild beasts, and (most mysterious and fearful self-abasement,) Satan tempting Him. Then, not before, they were allowed to shew themselves at hand with their adoring homage,—homage paid as to Him whom they knew to be their Lord and their God, and accepted by Him just after he had re-affirmed the rule, binding alike on angel and man, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.”

§. 5. The same words were once again uttered by the same voice at our Lord’s transfiguration: an earnest, no doubt, of His glory after His resurrection; but as they were not then accompanied by any special humiliation, so neither was there any response of angelic praise and worship.

§. 6. But the next occasion on which we do read of such ministration being accepted by our Lord after the flesh, is when He was in the lowest and saddest of His agony: “His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.—And there appeared an Angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him<sup>d</sup>.” S. Luke, who singly relates this, had omitted the homage of the Angels in his account of the temptation, but had added, that the devil’s then departing from our Lord was but “for a season;” i. e. until the moment came which in the same Gospel is described as the “hour” of Christ’s enemies, “and the power of darkness.” As though the good and bad spirits stood watching in their several ways for each new step in the process whereby He was “emptying Himself of His glory;” the one to indulge in their despairing fierceness, the other to pour themselves out in

<sup>d</sup> S. Luke xxii. 41—44.

adoring love and duty. Thus both the one and the other CHAP. II.  
 sort became witnesses—the one willing, the other unwilling—  
 of His condescension, and of the victory thereby achieved;  
 as the same Father again writes: "The Lord after His  
 baptism is tossed as with a tempest for a type of us, and  
 cometh first to be with wild beasts in the wilderness; then  
 having overcome these and their prince, He, as now a true  
 King, is ministered unto by Angels. For He who in the  
 flesh overcame Angels, good reason is it that Angels should  
 now be His servants<sup>e</sup>."

There were Angels attending, too, on Christ's resurrection,  
 but employed chiefly, as far as we are told, in guarding His  
 tomb and grave-clothes, and other tokens of humiliation, and  
 by them declaring His glory to those who came seeking Him.

§ 7. Thus from the moment of His Incarnation, while yet  
 in this world under the veil of His flesh, as well as afterwards,  
 now and unto the end of the world, while He is being "jus-  
 tified in the Spirit<sup>f</sup>,"—shown all holy and righteous by the  
 dispensation of the Holy Ghost,—Jesus Christ was and is  
 "seen of Angels;" or rather, as holy writers take it, "hath  
*appeared* unto Angels." For "that is said to *appear* which  
 hath it in its own power to be seen or not to be seen, and is  
 not under the power of the person seeing. Thus we say not,  
 'The stone appears to me,' but 'I see the stone.' If, there-  
 fore, an Angel had it in his own nature or power to see the  
 Word, it would not be said that the Word 'appeared' unto  
 him, but rather that he himself saw the Word when he would.  
 And therefore the Apostle saith, 'He *appeared* unto Angels,'  
 because in their own nature they saw Him not. And true it  
 is that from the beginning He appeared unto the Angels,  
 when upon their conversion to Him He made them par-  
 takers of a divine nature; but when He was made flesh,  
 many mysteries became known to the Angels which they had  
 not known before<sup>g</sup>." These are the things which they stoop  
 down from heaven "to look into,"—the sufferings of their  
 Lord and ours, and the glories that follow: the sufferings  
 first, and then the glories; in that order "the manifold

<sup>e</sup> S. Clem. Alex. Fragm., series i.  
 § 85.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 16.

<sup>g</sup> Aquin. in 1 Ep. ad Tim. c. iii. 16.

CHAP. II. wisdom of God" is "made known by the Church to the principalities and powers in heavenly places;" and whatever may be said of us fallen creatures, with them, we are sure, to know is to worship.

§ 8. Just as, on the other side, the evil Spirits, "the princes of this world," came to know by degrees the "wisdom" which the gospel "speaks among them that are perfect;" a kind of "wisdom not of this world," but the "wisdom of God in a mystery;" a wisdom which they knew not at first, for "had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory;" and as they knew more of it, they hated and scorned it more and more, as it is written, "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." So from the beginning the Church taught, "There were three mysteries unknown to the prince of this world—the virginity of Mary, her lying-in at Bethlehem, and the true account of our Lord's death; three mysteries most worthy to be proclaimed aloud, yet wrought in the silence of God<sup>i</sup>;" and the spite and malice of the devil was as discernible in regard of each of these mysteries, when he came to know them, as was the joy and salutation of the Angels; Herod, and the Pharisees, and Judas, being his instruments.

§ 9. That which, according to the same authority, takes place in the spiritual world among the good and bad Angels invisibly attending on every Holy Communion, is but another step in the same process. From the beginning it has been understood that the blessed Angels are ever at hand attending on the Christian altar, taking part in our hymns and thanksgivings, and wafting upward in a mysterious way all our dutiful prayers and offerings. St. Paul<sup>k</sup> makes this well-known fact a principle on which Christians ought to regulate all their demeanour, even their dress, in doing God service. "A woman ought to have power," i. e. some mark of her being under power and authority, "on her head, because of the Angels;" that everything may be done decently, and in order, in the presence of those glorious beings. And on the

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 6—8.

<sup>j</sup> S. Ignatius ad Ephes. c. 19.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 10.

other hand, Satan was waiting at the very first Eucharist of all to enter into Judas Iscariot; and we know what great and peculiar danger there is of his entering in and re-possessing unworthy communicants. CHAP. II.

Why are the Angels so especially present,—why is Satan so to be feared as near at hand,—in Holy Communion, more than in other Church ceremonies? Surely because the Gift is greater and nearer, and more distinctly applied to each one, and that with more unreserved condescension on the part of the Giver, than on any other occasion in the Christian life. Surely because it is the Word made Flesh, personally present and revealed in the truth of His human nature, and offering thereby to make His own partakers of His divine nature also: and “whosoever the Carcase,” the holy slain Body is, “thither will the eagles be gathered together;” the good, and saintly, and angelical Spirits to feed on it,—the Judases and enemies of Christ to mangle and to scorn it.

§ 10. All this is no more than Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the ancient Church, plainly teaches; and all this plainly implies a Real objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that to be both eaten and worshipped, in Holy Communion. It implies such an union of condescension and power for the deification (so termed by the Fathers) of each one of us<sup>1</sup>, as the very Incarnation and Cross exhibited for the salvation and redemption of all mankind. Therefore, as our Lord newly incarnate, and nailed to His Cross, was to be specially adored by men and Angels, so also in this Sacrament.

§ 11. Other scriptural facts and associations tending to the same conclusion are, First, The reverence ordained to be paid, and always paid from the beginning, to the Name of Jesus above all other names; to the sign of the Cross above all other signs; to the Gospels above other portions of Holy Scripture; and to Nazareth, Bethlehem, Calvary, above all other places.

Secondly, The peculiar significancy and use of the term Son of Man.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 2 S. Pet. i. 4.

## CHAP. II.

Thirdly, The ways in which believers, while He was yet on earth, found themselves gradually and instinctively drawn to worship Him present in the flesh, and the manner in which He received that worship.

Fourthly, and above all, The account constantly given of the rationale of the Holy Eucharist itself, both as a sacrifice, and as a sacrificial feast.

§ 12. As the Body of Jesus during His earthly sojourn was marked out to be honoured by the holy Angels, so afterwards was the Name of Jesus also; and, as we may reverently believe, for a like cause. The Body was to be especially glorified, as being the inferior part of Christ's inferior nature; the very footstool, as the Psalmist speaks, of His feet<sup>m</sup>; the flesh of the seed of the woman, which was to be bruised. In like manner, because Jesus is (humanly speaking) the name given to Him by a poor man as a poor woman's child,—the name by which He was ordinarily known when supposed to be a mere man among men,—because people called Him by that name while He went up and down as a carpenter's son, and Himself a carpenter, in the despised village of Nazareth:—because it was a name associated in the minds of all His acquaintance, during the first thirty years of His life, with the tasks and cares, and the very tools, of that ordinary trade; with recollections, indeed, of a most blameless and devout demeanour, but not as yet with anything transcendent, supernatural, or divine:—because it was the name which, being connected with Nazareth, (out of which town, it was taken for granted, no good thing could come,) proved afterwards through His whole ministry a most effectual stumbling-block to those who were unwilling to believe: because it was the name whereby He was described as a Nazarene, the name which His enemies in mockery wrote upon His cross, as contrasting most signally with His high and sacred claims: because it was the name whereby He should be named in scorn among all generations of the unbelieving,—(whether worldly-minded Romans, who could not endure to be told “that there is another King, one Jesus;” or bigoted Jews, exasperated by the notion that “this Jesus

<sup>m</sup> Ps. xcix. 5.

of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and change the customs which Moses delivered," and convinced therefore, with Saul, that they ought to do the most they could contrary to His name; or apostate Mahometans and heretics, in the East or in the West, delighting to call Him by that one of all His titles which they take to be merely of earth:—in one word, because it is the name most expressive of His humiliation, *therefore* His thoughtful servants would instinctively select it in preference to all His other names for especial honour and reverence.

§ 13. And so we see they did, prompted not by their feelings only, but by the special inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, whose will it was that in this way the dignity of Christ the Son of God, and His most true Incarnation, might never want a witness. The Angels called Him by that name to His honour, remembering, no doubt, how they had brought it from heaven, "Be not affrighted; ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified"; and the evil Spirits in their tormenting dread of Him,—“What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God?” “What have I to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth?” “What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of the most high God?” By that name, in preference to all others, the disciples proclaimed Him after His death<sup>1</sup>, and the Apostles after His ascension<sup>2</sup>. In that name they wrought their miracles: “In the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk;” “Anneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole;” “I command thee in the Name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.” By that name the forgers of lies pretended to cast out evil spirits: “I adjure thee,” they cried, “by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth.” To the Name of Jesus were annexed all saving as well as healing powers; “By the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole: neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”

<sup>1</sup> S. Mark xvi. 6.

<sup>2</sup> S. Mark i. 24.

<sup>3</sup> S. Mark v. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Acts ii. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Luke xxiv. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Acts iii. 6; ix. 34; xvi. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Acts xix. 13.

## CHAP. II.

Therefore to the Name of Jesus, rather than to any other, are to be referred the many promises made by God Almighty concerning His Name; whether things are said to be done *τῷ ὀνόματι*, “by the use and instrumentality of it,” as in S. Matt. vii. 22, “Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy Name? and in Thy Name have cast out devils? and in Thy Name done many wonderful works?” or *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, implying that it is He, not the visible agent, who doeth the work, or obtaineth the blessing, as in St. Mark xvi. 17, “In My Name they shall cast out devils;” and S. Luke x. 17, “Lord, even the very devils are subject unto us through Thy Name;” and especially in the gracious promises near the end of S. John’s Gospel, “Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My Name, He will do it;”—or *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, when in a mystery men are made or accounted partakers of the name, or of Him who is named, as in S. Matt. xviii. 20, “Where two or three are gathered together in My Name;” xxviii. 19, (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*.) “Unto the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” and S. John i. 12, “But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name;” which three texts declare respectively the virtue of the communion of saints, of baptism, and of faith, for the uniting of us to Christ;—or *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*, “for the pronouncing or profession of it;” as in S. Matt. xviii. 5, “Whosoever shall receive one such little one in My Name, receiveth Me;” and xxiv. 5, “Many shall come in My Name, saying, I am Christ;” and S. Luke xxiv. 47, “Remission of sins should be preached in His Name;” and Acts ii. 38, “Be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ;”—or *διὰ τὸ ὄνομα*, “because of the Name” outwardly called on them, and made a ground of persecution, as in S. Matt. xxiv. 9, “Ye shall be hated of all men for My Name’s sake;” and in S. John xv. 21, “All these things will they do unto you for My Name’s sake.”

§ 14. The Apostle, gathering together in one all these and the like promises, and the manifold daily fulfilments of

<sup>a</sup> In one instance the same form of speech seems to indicate the distinction of Persons in the Godhead itself; S. John xiv. 26.

them to which he was witness, did by the Holy Ghost enact and pronounce this canon, for the inward and outward worship of all God's reasonable and understanding creatures, not only in time, but in eternity, That "at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow.\*" Why at the Name of Jesus, rather than at that of Christ, or Immanuel, or Saviour, or any other of His good and great names? Why should Jesus be alone specified, as the Name which is above every name? Surely, if the Scripture did not expressly inform us, yet, from its indirect notices, such as have now been exemplified, a sufficiently probable answer might have been given to this question; but now we are not left in the smallest doubt. It was because, "being in the form of God," He "thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a Name which is above every name: that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." As if he should say, Jesus is His title of humiliation; therefore by that title He is evermore to receive especial homage.

§ 15. From Angels, both good and bad, He does receive it, as we have seen. In their several ways they bow, and ever will bow, their knees to the Name of Jesus. And the Holy Church from the beginning has venerated this Name above the rest, in affectionate reverence encouraging her children to refer to it on all occasions, in preference to any other of our Lord's names; as the very sayings of her enemies sufficiently prove, who cannot contain themselves for scorn at the cold, and strained, and forced allusions to that Name (so appearing to them) which the writers of the first ages are continually finding or inventing, both in Holy Scripture and in the course of nature and of Providence. A single instance will sufficiently explain what is meant. S. Clement

\* Philipp. ii. 10.

CHAP. II. of Alexandria, in the course of an essay in which he traces out the mystical tenor of each of the ten commandments, as indicated by the number which marks its place, says of the collective meaning of them all<sup>y</sup>, "The Decalogue taken altogether doth, by the letter I (=10) signify the blessed Name, setting before us JESUS, Who is the word."

If you ask why this Name is set forth in preference to any other of His names, S. Augustine will answer for the rest:—"Jesus has one meaning, Christ another: Jesus Christ our Saviour being one only; Jesus, nevertheless, is His proper Name. As Moses, Elijah, Abraham, were so called by their proper names, so our Lord, for His proper Name, hath the Name Jesus; whereas Christ is His sacramental Name<sup>z</sup>;" or, as S. Augustine goes on to explain, His name of office, "as if you should call a man prophet or priest." That is why the Church has always distinguished the Name of Jesus above all other names,—because it is His very own Name: the Bride delights in it, because it is the very own Name of Him whom her soul loveth; His own Name, which He assumed as the token of His taking her to Himself for ever, and of the infinite, inconceivable condescension of His being made man in order to that union.

Therefore, as a distinguished mediæval commentator witnesses, "There is a common and laudable custom of the Church, whereby the Name JESUS is even more honoured than the Name God. For which cause, when the Name of JESUS is heard, the faithful people either bow the head or bend the knees; which they do not on hearing the Name of God<sup>a</sup>."

S. Bernard gives a testimony such as one might expect from the author of the "*Jesu, dulcis Memoria*." Preaching on Canticles i. 3, *Thy Name is oil poured out*, he says<sup>b</sup>, "I shew you a Name which is fitly compared to oil; how fitly, I will explain. Many titles of the Bridegroom you read here and there in every page of God's Book, but in two I will embrace them all for you. You will not, I think, find one which

<sup>y</sup> Strom. vi. 145.

<sup>z</sup> S. Aug. in 1 Ep. Johannis, tr. iii.

§ 6.

<sup>a</sup> Abulensis, in Corn. à Lapide on Philipp. ii. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Serm. xv. § 1, 3, 4.

sounds not either of the grace of Mercy, or the power of Majesty. . . *These two things I have heard,—that power be-  
longeth unto God, and that Thou, Lord, art MERCIFUL.* E. g.  
'The Lord our righteousness' is a name of power; 'Em-  
manuel,' of mercy. Now the name of majesty and power  
is in a certain way poured *over* into that which is of mercy  
and grace; and the latter is poured *out* abundantly by Jesus  
Christ our Saviour. . . 'Run, ye nations: salvation is at hand;  
the Name is poured out, which whosoever will call on shall  
be saved.' 'I recognise the Name of which I have read in  
Isaiah, *He will call His own servants by another name,  
wherein whosoever is blessed upon the earth, shall be blessed  
in the Lord.* O blessed Name! O oil poured out in all  
directions! Where will it stop? From heaven it runneth  
out upon Judæa, and thence over all the earth; and from  
the whole world the Church crieth out, *Thy Name is oil  
poured out*,—poured out, indeed, so that not only hath it  
imbued heaven and earth, but hath sprinkled also the un-  
seen world, so that *at the Name of Jesus every knee should  
bow, of things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth,  
and every tongue confess and say, Thy Name is oil poured  
out.*"

It would appear that there was no need of enforcing this  
reverence by synodical enactment until one hundred years  
after S. Bernard; but in the second Council of Lyons, 1274,  
the Church uttered this among other most impressive warn-  
ings: "'Holiness becometh the house of the Lord;' it is be-  
coming that He whose abode hath been made in peace, should  
be worshipped in peace with due veneration. Wherefore let  
men's entrance into churches be humble and devout. Let  
their demeanour therein be quiet, well-pleasing to God, com-  
posed in sight of men, such as not only to edify, but to  
soothe thoughtful observers. When they come together in  
that place, the *Name which is above every name, besides  
which there is none other under heaven given unto men*, where-  
in believing they must be saved, i. e. the Name of JESUS  
Christ, who saved His people from their sins,—that Name let  
them exalt by manifestation of especial reverence. And that  
which is written concerning all, that 'in the Name of Jesus

CHAP. II. every knee should bow,' the same let each for his own part fulfil in himself, (especially while the sacred mysteries of the Eucharist are being celebrated,) by bowing the knees of his heart at every mention of that glorious Name, and in witness thereof at least inclining his head<sup>c</sup>."

§ 16. Neither has the reformed Church of England ever had any scruple in continuing so dutiful a ceremony; only it appears by the 52nd Injunction of Queen Elizabeth, 1559, that there was need to enforce it, not as a new thing, but as an ancient custom in more or less danger of disparagement. "It is to be necessarily received, . . . that whensoever the Name of JESUS shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise in the Church pronounced, due reverence be made of all persons both young and old, with lowness of courtesy, and uncovering of heads of the men kind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed<sup>d</sup>."

In what quarter, and from what spirit, the necessity for this injunction arose, we may gather from the following passage of Cartwright's first Admonition<sup>e</sup>: "When JESUS is named, then off goeth the cap, and down goeth the knee, with such a scraping on the ground, that they cannot hear a good while after, so that the word is hindered; but when other names of God are mentioned, they make no curtesy at all; as though the names of God were not equal, or as though all reverence ought to be given to the syllables."

What Hooker, on the part of the Church, replies to this, will be cited presently. Whitgift, affirming also the primitive origin of the ceremony, adds, in substance, the same account of it:—"One reason that moved Christians in the beginning the rather to bow at the Name of Jesus than at any other name of God, was because this name was most hated and most contemned of the wicked Jews and other persecutors of such as professed the Name of Jesus<sup>f</sup>."

The royal injunction, as everyone knows, was confirmed a few years afterwards by synodical authority:—"When in time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned,

<sup>c</sup> Hard. vii. 716.

<sup>d</sup> Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, i. 198.

<sup>e</sup> Abp. Whitgift, *Defence*, &c., 749.

<sup>f</sup> Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.*, V. xxx. 3, and note.

due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, CHAP. II. as it hath been accustomed, testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind for this life, and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised &c." And this regulation seems generally to have been acquiesced in, so far, at least, as that the Presbyterian divines in the Savoy Conference make no mention of bowing at the holy Name as one of the points which then disturbed men's consciences in the Prayer-book.

§ 17. Now all the reasons alleged from the beginning, and accepted by the universal Church and our own, for the honouring the Name of Jesus above all other names, hold with as great or greater force for special adoration of our Lord in the holy Eucharist, and make it still more imperative upon the prohibitors to produce some irresistible authority from Holy Scripture, or express Church law, if they would bring their prohibition home to a Christian man's conscience. Was Jesus the Name, among all His names, most expressive of His deep humiliation? So are the sacramental elements among all the means of grace, both as being in themselves so cheap and ordinary, and as representing especially His Death and Passion. Was Jesus our Lord's *proper* Name, brought from heaven, with a command that by It above other names we should make mention of Him? So was the holy Eucharist divinely ordained, that by It above all other rites we should make memorial of Him. Is Jesus His Name as a Man—one of ourselves? So is the holy Eucharist that by which He, the Wisdom of the Father, delighteth to be among the sons of men<sup>b</sup>. Is the Name of Jesus especially connected everywhere with the healing, saving works of the Son of God, and expressly made adorable both by men and angels? Yet no promise associated with it can surpass what He, who is Truth, has annexed for ever to the eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. Has the reverence due to this Name been ever cherished in the Church, as one great safeguard of

<sup>a</sup> 18th Canon, 1603.

<sup>b</sup> Prov. viii. 31.

the faith of His true Incarnation? So we know that against ancient heretics one topic for effectually asserting that same faith in its integrity was the analogy between it and the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, testified by our adoration.

It should seem, then, that whatever can be alleged for peculiar devotion to the holy Name, the same, and much more, can be alleged for peculiar devotion to the holy Thing received in the Sacrament; with this single exception, that we have no distinct form of words commanding us to adore in Holy Communion, as we have commanding us to bow at the Name of Jesus. But we have (as I hope presently to shew) declarations of our Lord fully equivalent to any such form of words. In the meantime, the simple fact that adoration is commanded at the mention of Christ's human Name might well warrant the Church in claiming it for the Real Presence of His holy Humanity.

§ 18. The same principle is recognised in the rubric which enjoins standing up while the Gospel is read; not, of course, as though it were more truly and entirely God's Word than the Epistle and other Scriptures are, but because it is that portion of God's Word in which He most abases Himself, hiding His Divinity and Majesty beneath that humble and lowly veil. So universal was this custom, that Sozomen, writing in the middle of the fifth century, knew but of one exception to it, and that was in the Church of Alexandria, where the bishop continued sitting even at that time<sup>1</sup>. The Apostolical Constitutions<sup>k</sup>, which, in such matters, may probably be taken as representing the general mind of the Church, direct as follows:—"When the Gospels are in reading, let all the priests and deacons, and all the people, stand up in great quietness; for it is written, 'Be still, and hearken, O Israel.' And again, 'But do thou stand here and listen!'" S. Chrysostom on the beginning of S. Matthew says, "Let us not therefore with noise and tumult enter in, but with the silence due to mysteries; for, if in a theatre, when a great silence hath been made, then the letters of the king are read, much more in this city must all be com-

<sup>1</sup> ii. 57.<sup>k</sup> ii. 57.<sup>1</sup> Deut. v. 37.

posed, *and stand with soul and ear erect.* For it is not the letters of any earthly master, but of the Lord of angels, which are presently to be read.” CHAP. II.

The rationale of this, as of bowing at the Name, is expressed by Hooker in words which it would be wrong to omit, because they contain in them the principle of all that has been now alleged:—“It sheweth a reverend regard to the Son of God above other messengers, although speaking as from God also. And against Infidels, Jews, Arians, who derogate from the honour of Jesus Christ, such ceremonies are most profitable.” As if he should say, “Behold God Himself coming close to us, and humbling Himself to do so: so much the more ought we to adore Him.”

§ 19. By the same rule that the Name of Jesus is to be honoured above all other names, the sign of the Cross has been set apart from the beginning to be honoured above all other signs. I say, “from the beginning,” for such undoubtedly is the case: it is not here as in some other Church usages: the further we go back in Christian antiquity, the more distinctly and unequivocally does this devotion appear. If we look to the employment of it in baptism, and in almost every other holy ceremony, as well as in the practice of ordinary life, we have the well-known witness of Tertullian<sup>m</sup>. If to the instinctive use made of it in emergencies and dangers, spiritual or temporal, we have the allusion of S. Cyprian<sup>n</sup>, the statement of Origen<sup>o</sup>, and the earnest exhortation of S. Chrysostom<sup>p</sup>.—If to the practical and mystical

<sup>m</sup> De Corona Mil. c. 4, ap. Hooker, V. lxx. 2.

<sup>n</sup> ii. 125. “Muniatur frons, ut signum Dei incolume servetur.”

<sup>o</sup> Fragm. from Origen on Ezekiel ix. 4 (after mentioning two other persons, with their interpretations):—“A third, professing to have believed in Jesus, said that in the ancient alphabet, Thau resembles the sign of the cross, and that the prophecy relates to the sign made among Christians on the forehead, which all believers employ at the commencement of any transaction whatever, but especially of prayers and holy readings.” It is the Samaritan Thau—so the editor of S. Jerome

adds—which Origen refers to. Ap. Oper. Hieron. v. 95; Origen, ed. Bened. iii. 424.

<sup>p</sup> 21 Hom. de Statuis, t. vi. 611: “When thou art on the point of stepping over the threshold of thy door, utter this word first, ‘I renounce thee, Satan, and thy pomp, and thy service; and I enrol myself under Thee, O Christ.’ And do thou never go out without this word. This shall be to thee a staff, a shield, an impregnable tower. And with this word form thou also the cross upon thy forehead: for so, not only no man meeting thee, but not even the devil himself shall be able to hurt thee at all.”

CHAP. II. way of detecting allusions to it in nature, we have S. Justin Martyr referring the very heathen to it<sup>1</sup>. If, lastly, we look to their expositions of Holy Scripture, we find among those early writers a consent all but universal and unhesitating; the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, from beginning to end, disclosing to their Christian instinct anticipations of the blessed Cross: and, chiefest of all, we find them with a wonderful accord interpreting our Lord's own solemn prediction, "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven<sup>r</sup>," of some mysterious appearance of the sign of the Cross. And it cannot be denied that our Lord's own words give countenance to the interpretation, in that from a very early period of His ministry, from the very first mission of the Apostles, He spoke to them of the Cross as of that which must be taken up in order to follow Him,—thus making it His badge, apparently,—long before they could know His meaning<sup>s</sup>. And it is plain that by the time S. Paul wrote his Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, the "preaching of the Cross" had come to be understood as equivalent to the preaching of Christianity; the whole Gospel being denominated from that outward and visible thing, which He made the providential instrument of the most awful and mysterious fact revealed in it. In a word, the exaltation of the Cross above all other Christian signs is the most pregnant, or rather the crowning, instance of the rule, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted," and would lead us to anticipate some signal honour as likely to be accounted due to the holy Eucharist, associated as that Sacrament inseparably is with what took place on the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Apol. 55.

<sup>r</sup> S. Matt. xxiv. 30. On which verse Origen (iii. 866) says: "The sign of the Son of Man will then appear, whereby have been made heavenly, the things which were in heaven, and which were in earth; i.e. the wonder wrought by the Son hanging on the tree: and in heaven have been especially His sign shall be bright." And S. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. xiii. 45): "This sign shall appear again with Jesus from heaven. For the King's trophy shall lead the way; that seeing Him whom they pierced, and by the Cross recognising the dishonoured One, the Jews

may repent and mourn, and we may exult." And S. Chrysostom, Hom. in Matt. liv.: "Be not thou ashamed of so great a good, lest Christ be ashamed of thee, when He cometh with His glory, and the sign appeareth before Him more brilliant than the very sun-beam. For indeed the Cross is then coming, uttering a voice by the very sight of it," &c. And Hom. lxxxvi.: "Then shall appear the sign, i.e. the Cross, being brighter than the sun; since it appears when the sun is darkened, and hiding itself."

<sup>s</sup> S. Matt. x. 38; cf. xvi. 22; S. Luke xviii. 34.

Cross, and with the further humiliation, that He who made CHAP. II.  
and filleth all things doth vouchsafe to veil Himself under  
symbols so cheap and ordinary, ("a little bread and wine,"  
as speaks a devout writer,) and thereby to submit His blessed  
Body to so many reproaches and indignities.

§ 20. The Name of Jesus being thus honoured above the  
rest of our Lord's Names, and the sign of the Cross above all  
other His Signs,—the Vine, the Lamb, the Fish, the Branch,  
and the like;—no wonder that among the Places made holy  
by His earthly abode or mighty works, those have ever been  
most venerated which saw most of His humiliation and suf-  
ferings; and before all the rest, Nazareth, Bethlehem, and  
Calvary. In the honour paramount to all others, which  
Christendom has ever paid to those three places, we perceive  
an instinctive acknowledgment of our Lord's true Incar-  
nation and Atonement. Had He been but the chief of men,  
the places of His conception, birth, and death would have  
been indeed exceedingly interesting; but the interest would  
not have been comparable to what would have been felt in  
visiting Capernaum and the other great scenes of His mi-  
nistry. The constant feeling of Christians on this subject  
has been a witness from age to age of their belief in Him, God  
made Man, and of their yearning to express that belief in all  
holy ceremonies,—religious pilgrimage being one. If, through  
the changed circumstances and habits of the Christian world,  
we are in a way precluded from this or any other form of de-  
votion, surely it is natural that we should cling the more ear-  
nestly to those modes and forms which Providence still leaves  
within our reach; jealously guard them, and scrupulously  
make the most of them. If we cannot be pilgrims, we will  
at least, please God, be humble worshippers in the holy  
Eucharist.

§ 21. Why, again it may be asked, is the term "Son of  
Man" beyond all others His own chosen title, whereby He  
speaks of Himself, and whereby His beloved disciple<sup>1</sup>, and first  
martyr<sup>2</sup>—no others—are permitted to speak of Him? Not,  
surely, for love's sake only, and to signify how that it is His

<sup>1</sup> Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Acts vii. 56.

CHAP. II. delight to be with the sons of men ; but for truth's sake, and for doctrine's sake ;—or rather, in this question, love, and truth, and doctrine are all one. From His first assuming of the title when He spake to Nathanael, within three or four days of the beginning of His ministry, until the last application of it in Holy Scripture, when S. John saw sitting on a cloud “one like unto the Son of Man,”—forty-two instances, or thereabouts,—we do not find one which is not emphatically marked as conveying this lesson,—that all our participation of God, or of any good thing, is by way of virtue flowing out from Christ's holy Humanity, which is therefore to be specially loved, and adored, and trusted in by us, with an infinite love, trust, and adoration : that saying of the wise man being eminently appropriate here ; “When ye glorify the Lord, exalt Him as much as ye can ; for even yet will He far exceed : and when ye exalt Him, put forth all your strength, and be not weary ; for ye can never go far enough<sup>x</sup>.”

To take a few signal instances :—As the Son of Man He reopens the miraculous intercourse between heaven and earth, now in a manner suspended for many generations. Heaven is seen opened, and “the Angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.” As the Son of Man He is in such sense one with God, His Person being truly divine, that He is at the same time in heaven and in earth, having come down from heaven. He “hath power on earth to forgive sins ;” “authority” is given Him of the Father “to execute judgment ;” He is “Lord of the Sabbath ;” He will one day “confess” His own “before the Angels of God ;” it is He who “soweth good seed” in the world<sup>y</sup>.

But most remarkably is this title connected with His office at the last judgment. The Son of Man will be glorified, will sit on the throne of His glory, will come in the glory of His Father with His angels ; His sign will appear before Him in heaven ; we shall see Him coming in a cloud with power and great glory. His martyrs even now see Him by faith at the right hand of God ; His friends, in vision among the golden lamps, which are His Churches ; and both

<sup>x</sup> Eccles. xliii. 30.

ix. 6 ; S. John v. 27 ; S. Matt. xii. 8 ;

<sup>y</sup> S. John i. 52 ; iii. 13 ; S. Matt.

S. Luke xii. 8 ; S. Matt. xiii. 37.

friends and enemies will see Him ere long on the cloud, which is His throne, about to reap the harvest of the earth <sup>z</sup>.

All these wonders are His work, as He is Son of Man; and by the same title He claims to Himself all His marvellous and mysterious sufferings: He hath not where to lay His head; He cometh eating and drinking, to incur the Pharisees' reproach; He veileth His greatness, so that a word against Him may be forgiven; He is buried three days in the heart of the earth; He must suffer many things, and will not endure that His disciples should disbelieve it; He must be lifted up, for He is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them; not to be ministered unto, but to minister; He must be betrayed, and go as it is written of Him; betrayed by Judas,—betrayed with a kiss <sup>a</sup>.

"I, the Son of Man <sup>b</sup>,"—such is the title which from the first He had taken to Himself in preference to all others; signifying thereby to thoughtful hearts, that He was the very seed of the woman, the Second Adam promised to undo what the first had done. And each successive application of the title, whether in the way of power or of endurance, may be seen to bring out more and more fully this His gracious remedial office.

We shall see presently how devotion to the title, Son of Man, is by His own word connected with devotion to His blessed Body. But to appreciate this duly, we must go back to the beginning of our Lord's ministry, and consider at large what the Gospels record, be it much or little, of things said or done by Him, in a way to teach or encourage this latter devotion.

§ 22. Now as we have seen that to the angels our Lord's humiliation in the flesh was a mystery, which they had to learn by degrees, so to His disciples and friends on earth was the exaltation of that flesh; and they were trained by their experience of the virtue which went out of it in the way of corporal and physical miracles, to believe in and

<sup>z</sup> S. John xii. 23; S. Matt. xix. 28, xvi. 27, xxiv. 30; Acts vii. 56; Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14.

<sup>a</sup> S. Matt. viii. 20, xi. 19, xii. 32,

ib. 40, xvii. 22, xx. 18; S. John xii. 35; S. Luke ix. 56; S. Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 24, ib. 45; S. Luke xxii. 48.

<sup>b</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 13.

## CHAP. II.

adore its wonder-working presence, when it should be made known to them as the very food and medicine of their souls. The Forerunner himself declared that he did not at first know our Lord. His Person he probably knew, for in the flesh he was near akin to Him; he knew so much of Him before He came to be baptized, as to decline, if it might be, performing such an office for one so far his superior; but he knew not as yet the fulness of the divine economy, for which Jesus came into the world; he knew not that this was the very Son of God, who was to baptize with the Holy Ghost, according to John's own announcing, and so, i. e. by a dispensation of sacraments, to fulfil all righteousness, in the justification and sanctification of His elect<sup>c</sup>.

All this John came to know by the marvellous course of our Lord's baptism, and from henceforth he referred his disciples directly to our Lord; and our Lord, accepting their implicit faith, promised them, through Nathanael, immediate confirmation of it by miracles: and the very next day was the first miracle, in Cana of Galilee, Nathanael's home; a miracle best explained, surely, as a symbolical preaching of the new heaven and the new earth, to be brought into being by that participation of Christ whereof wine was to be a principal instrument.

Then followed that course of miracles in Jerusalem, about the time of the first Passover, which brought Nicodemus to be instructed, and concerning which He signified to the Jews, that they were but the earnest of a greater miracle, whereby His Body should be proved to be a true Temple—a living Temple—the personal abode of the Word made Flesh and dwelling among us.

§ 23. For the three years afterwards during which "He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," it will be found on examination that His ordinary miracles, by far the greater part of them, were wrought not without some visible touch of His Body. There seems an incongruity in measuring and counting such things—"the works of God, who maketh all;" yet since He has condescended to set down for our learning a certain number of

<sup>c</sup> See this proved by S. Augustine, in Joh. tr. v.

them, it cannot be wrong to take notice of that number; CHAP. II.  
and so it is, that if you reckon up the miracles of healing especially recorded as wrought by Christ in the flesh, you will, I believe, find that two-thirds, twenty-two out of thirty-three, were wrought, as was said, by the Touch, immediate or virtual, of His Body.

§ 24. The exceptions are, first, Five instances in which He had to do with unclean spirits; for, whatever were the reason, it does seem that He never *laid His hand* upon demoniacs. The distinction is strongly marked in one of the first instances, towards the beginning of the Gospel: "In the Synagogue," at Capernaum, "there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil<sup>d</sup>," who did as it were challenge and defy the Holy One; him Jesus rebuked, "saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not. And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power He commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out<sup>e</sup>." Presently after, on leaving the synagogue, He went "into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever. And He touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them<sup>f</sup>." The evil spirit He cast out with a word; the sick woman He took by the hand and lifted her up.

These two miracles occurring in the middle of the day, were followed the same evening by multitudes in each kind; in all of which, as we learn by comparison of the several accounts, the same difference was observable. S. Matthew says, "When the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils: and He cast out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick<sup>g</sup>;" and S. Luke adds how these latter were healed: "*He laid His hands* on every one of them, and healed them<sup>h</sup>." As to the unclean spirits, he mentions them apart in the next verse; "and devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God<sup>i</sup>."

<sup>d</sup> S. Luke iv. 33.<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 35, 36.<sup>f</sup> S. Matt. viii. 14, 15.<sup>g</sup> Ibid. 16.<sup>h</sup> S. Luke iv. 40.<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 41.

## CHAP. II.

Again, at the great manifestation of Himself which accompanied the ordination of the twelve, we are told by another Evangelist nearly in the same words, "He had healed many; insomuch that they pressed upon Him for to touch Him, as many as had plagues. And unclean spirits, when they saw Him, fell down before Him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God<sup>j</sup>."

The only case recorded of His touching a possessed person is that which occurred just after the Transfiguration. "When Jesus saw that the people came running together, He rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose<sup>k</sup>." This, however, it will be presently seen, is no exception, but critically confirms our allegation. The devil was cast out by His mere word; when He touched the sufferer's hand, and lifted him up, it was but to revive him from his exhaustion,—the dispossession being before complete.

We may reverently ask, why this distinction? and we seem to have an answer, if we may assume the course of our Lord's miracles generally to be symbolical of the greater invisible miracles which He was to work by His Spirit in His Church; i. e. of His holy sacramental system; according to His most true promise,—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto My Father<sup>l</sup>.” On that hypothesis, the spiritual *exorcism* which must go before the spiritual *touch* of Christ,—so distracting and agonizing, sometimes, even in its outward and visible effects,—may well be represented by the Spirit's crying out, tearing and rending the poor patient, at the very sight of his Deliverer, and much more at the command to “come out of the man;” and the purifying, strengthening, refreshing grace of the two great Sacraments, whereby we are made participators of Christ, answers to His loving and powerful

<sup>j</sup> S. Mark iii. 10, 11.<sup>k</sup> S. Mark ix. 25—27.<sup>l</sup> S. John xiv. 12.

Touch, taking him, as he lay, by the right hand, and lifting him up. CHAP. II.

§ 25. Six other cases occur in which, for aught we see, our Lord might have touched the person, and it pleased Him to heal with a word only. In each of these we may observe, I think, unusual stress laid in the narrative on the Faith of the person receiving the cure, or of those by whom he was presented to our Lord. Two of them happened at Capernaum, to persons of rank. The nobleman, somewhat tardy in his belief, was however rewarded for it when it came, by our Lord healing his son at a distance; the Centurion, his townsman, in his good and ready confession at once of Christ's power and of his own unworthiness, shewed a faith marvellous even to Jesus Christ Himself. Of those who brought the man sick of the palsy we read, "Jesus seeing *their faith*," forgave and healed him—not without some trial of the sufferer's own faith also; for it was a great trial to so helpless a person to set about obeying the command, "Arise, take up thy bed and go unto thine house." The like may be said of what happened at the pool of Bethesda, and of the man bidden to stretch forth his withered hand; and, in a different way, of the ten lepers setting out to shew themselves to the priests. By these comparatively rare examples our Lord may have designed to symbolize the necessity of faith in all capable receivers of sacraments, and the sufficiency of it in certain cases without literally receiving; according to the principle, *Gratia Dei non est alligata sacramentis*.

§ 26. But however this may be, the general fact is obvious to the most cursory reader of the Gospel, that almost as soon as ever He came to be known by His miraculous cures, the touch of His blessed Body came also to be known as the ordinary visible mean whereby He performed them. Beginning from Simon's house and the streets of Capernaum, "the fame of Him went out into all Syria," not only of His healing, but of His touching or laying on of hands in order to heal<sup>m</sup>. Thenceforth we meet with such sayings as, "Come and lay *Thine hand* upon her, and she shall live;" the deaf and the

<sup>m</sup> Cf. S. Luke vi. 19.

CHAP. II. blind are brought to Him, with a request that He would *lay His hands* upon them ; mighty works are said to be done by His *Hands* ; He could do no mighty works at Nazareth, save that “ *He laid His hands* upon a few sick folk ;” — the turn of expression indicates how completely the idea of mighty works of healing was associated in the writer’s mind with *laying on of hands*. Indeed, it could not well be otherwise, seeing that our Lord Himself, promising miraculous power to the first generation at least of those who should believe, had used the same form : “ they shall *lay hands* on the sick, and they shall recover<sup>n</sup>.” After a while it came into the heart of the humble person with the issue of blood to come and touch the hem of His garment ; and, instead of a reproof for superstition, she received not only the virtue which went out of Him to heal her, but also His solemn approval, and a blessing on her faith. And this, too, spread abroad ; so that a short time after, “ wheresoever He entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought Him that they might touch *if it were but the border of His garment* : and as many as touched Him were made whole<sup>o</sup>.”

It should seem, moreover, that an additional sanction to this popular notion is supplied by each of those remarkable cases in which our Lord was pleased to withdraw Himself, and deal in a peculiar way with certain sufferers ; such as the deaf and dumb man in S. Mark vii. Being asked only to lay His hand on him, He takes him apart from the multitude, puts His fingers into his ears, spits, and touches his tongue ; and again, at Bethsaida, a blind man is brought to Him with the same petition : “ and when He had spit on his eyes, and put His hands upon him, He asked him if he saw ought. And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. After that He put His hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up : and he was restored, and saw every man clearly<sup>p</sup>.” And then the well-known cure of the man born blind, in S. John ix., which also seems to have taken place in private : “ He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by

<sup>n</sup> S. Mark xvi. 18.<sup>o</sup> Ib. vi. 56.<sup>p</sup> Ib. viii. 23.

interpretation, Sent). He went his way therefore, and washed, CHAP. II.  
and came seeing." These may well remind us of the singular and exact discipline ever observed when the Church was free to use it; the cure of all inward evils being one and the same,—the Body and Blood of Christ; but the time and mode of its application, and the degree of tender and charitable reserve employed, varying much with the specialties of the case.

§ 27. The minds of the disciples, and indeed of all within hearing of our Lord, being thus providentially trained to think much of His blessed Body as the instrument of all good to them; and also, as we have seen of His title, Son of Man, as indicating rather than any other the relation in which He vouchsafed to stand to them; it could not but strike them deeply (such as were at all thoughtful among them), and dwell much upon their minds, when towards the beginning of the third year of His ministry (a time of many great revelations concerning Himself), He bound the two ideas together in the way recorded by S. John. He told them, first, that the Son of Man should give them meat; secondly, that this meat was only to be had by eating His flesh and drinking His blood; and, thirdly, that this was to be done in a heavenly, supernatural manner—a manner cognizable only by faith, since it would be consistent with their seeing "the Son of Man ascend up where He was before<sup>a</sup>." If the title, "Son of Man," as the Church has always believed, means the Second Adam, the root of life as Adam of death,—coming in a true body to save men's bodies as well as their souls,—what were they to imagine of this eating unto life, but that it should be real and true, as was that by which Adam ate unto death? a real and true eating of His real and true Body, which should constitute a great and indispensable portion of the marvellous system of divine mercies now in course of being revealed to them. It is plain they did so understand Him; why otherwise should they be offended? Had the eating and drinking been commonly understood, as some writers think, to be a sort of parable, a figure to express the

<sup>a</sup> S. John vi. 27, 53, 62.

CHAP. II. receiving our Lord's doctrine, there was nothing in that saying so hard, but they might very well have borne with it. But we see that at the time it was taken by all, both friends and enemies, as a great and real mystery, and that it proved just the same sort of trial to the Jews who drew back, to the Eleven who believed, though they could not understand, and to Judas, who remained with Christ in hypocrisy, as the Holy Communion has evermore been to rejectors and unworthy receivers on the one hand, and to faithful communicants on the other.

It must not be overlooked, that around these great sayings are gathered, as it were, a group of miraculous doings, every one suggesting more or less plainly the supernatural virtue of our Lord's body. First they came to Him and He healed their sicknesses; then—not without His taking them into His hands and breaking them—the loaves were multiplied and distributed; then in His true flesh, by the power of His true Godhead, He walked on the water; then He communicated virtue to His favoured Apostle to do the same; and when he was sinking and cried out, "Jesus stretched forth His hand and caught him;" finally, "when they were gone over, they came into the land of Gennesaret: and when the men of that place had knowledge of Him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto Him all that were diseased; and besought Him that they might only touch the hem of His garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole<sup>r</sup>."

§ 28. And what if the other miracle, happening so soon after, and recalling this by so many circumstances, were intended to represent the great doctrine and ordinance under another of its "aspects?" I mean the feeding of the four thousand with seven loaves and a few small fishes<sup>s</sup>. If the former miracle was typical of the Eucharist, as by the consent of Christendom (one may say) it surely was, it seems hard not to associate the later one also with that sacrament. And if, as ancient writers teach<sup>t</sup>, and as the

<sup>r</sup> S. Matt. xiv. 35, 36.

<sup>s</sup> S. Matt. xv. 32; S. Mark viii. 1.

<sup>t</sup> S. Aug. Serm. 227: "Si bene ac-

cepistis, vos estis quod accepistis. Apostolus enim dicit, 'Unus panis, unum corpus, multi sumus.' Sic exposuit Sa-

chief of the schoolmen undoubtedly taught, (grounding their opinion mainly upon S. Paul's saying, 'For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread;') the Church, or mystical body of Christ, may be regarded as present by the real presence of His heavenly and glorified Body, and so as constituting—in a secondary sense, and one infinitely below the glory and dignity of the other, yet in a very true sense—the *res sacramenti*, or thing signified in Holy Communion"; then the circumstances of the miracle in question may seem to make it a sufficiently apt parable for the expression of that doctrine. The twelve loaves being a known symbol in the old dispensation for the twelve tribes, i. e. for the whole Jewish Church, and as such presented day by day in the temple; and seven being the number which from the beginning, in the figurative language of Scripture, had represented completeness<sup>x</sup>; the seven loaves, by no forced analogy, might be taken to represent the whole Christian Church, and the partaking of them after Christ's special blessing, to signify that union and incorporation of Christians one with another, which, depending on their union with Christ their Head, is perfected more and more by every sacramental participation of Him; according to His own prayer, offered in conjunction with the very original Eucharist: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us<sup>y</sup>."

And since the fish is an acknowledged emblem both of our Lord and of His members, and in the former miracle the two fishes are considered by S. Augustine<sup>z</sup> to represent Christ in His two characters of King and Priest, it might not, perhaps, be straining the exposition of this latter miracle too far, were we to conjecture that the few small fishes which "He blessed and commanded to be also set before them," might

cramentum Mensæ Dominicæ." Cf. Serm. 229, 272. "Si vos estis Corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis."

<sup>a</sup> Aquinas, Summ. Theol. p. iii. qu. 60. 3: "In Sacramento Altaris est duplex res significata, scilicet Corpus Christi verum et mysticum;" qu. 80.

4: "Duplex est res hujus Sacramenti . . . una quidem, quæ est significata et contenta, scilicet ipse Christus; alia autem est significata et non contenta, scilicet Corpus Christi mysticum, quod est societas Sanctorum."

<sup>x</sup> S. Aug. Serm. xcv. 2.

<sup>y</sup> S. John xvii. 21.

<sup>z</sup> De diversis quæst. lxi. 2, t. vii. 25.

CHAP. II. represent the holy martyrs and other eminent saints, few, and very small in comparison, but in some especial manner and degree having Christ imparted to them more than to the rest, and therefore especially called by the same title with Him; and the partaking of those fishes may answer to the Communion of Saints, as that of the loaves to our portion in the holy Catholic Church. The four thousand may be the multitudes coming in from the four winds of heaven—north, south, east, and west,—to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the spiritual feast, the kingdom of heaven. If the old method of interpretation be at all allowed, this would seem no improbable account of the second miraculous feast, occurring so soon after the first, and tending in its degree to deepen the impression that the Body of Christ was to be, in some mysterious way, all in all to those who should be saved by Him.

§ 29. Very shortly after, but not until His divine nature also had been more openly than ever declared to His disciples, by the benediction pronounced to S. Peter on his confession,—nor yet until He had begun to predict to them in detail what He was to suffer,—He took His three chosen into a high mountain apart, and shewed them that Body, in which He had so many ways invited them to trust, transfigured,—His face shining as the sun, and His raiment white as the light;—thereby, as it may appear, giving them to understand something of the properties of His glorious Body; at the same time that, by the discourse in their hearing with Moses and Elias, He prepared them to see it in the lowest humiliation and suffering. And twice on the same occasion He taught them to believe that it was, and always would be, a real Body, and as such the instrument of all good to all believers, by touching, first, the three saints, (as Ezekiel and Daniel had been touched of old,) and so enabling them to endure the beatific vision; and presently afterwards by touching the young man out of whom the evil spirit had been cast, and restoring him to his father, and to the state of probation and hope.

Between the Transfiguration and the week of our Lord's Passion there is nothing on record to draw attention to the

prerogatives of His blessed Body, if we except perhaps what CHAP. II.  
took place at the Feast of Tabernacles, in the last year of His preaching,—when, having asserted His Godhead, and seeing that the Jews were taking up stones to stone Him, Jesus made Himself invisible, “and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by<sup>a</sup>.” And “passing by,” He healed the man blind from his birth; not without spitting, and making clay of the spittle, and anointing the eyes of the blind man with the clay; proceedings surely well calculated to impress those who knew of His Transfiguration, especially, with an increasing awe towards that Body which they saw so marvellously and peculiarly gifted, beyond the bodies of the sons of men; and with a wondering expectation what Almighty God might be on the point of working thereby.

§ 30. The Holy Week itself begins with the anointing at Bethany, commended by our Lord Himself to all ages as a signal instance of devotion to His blessed Body, and ever understood by the holy Church as a warrant for sparing no trouble nor expense in providing for that service especially, which acknowledges the mysterious continuance of the same among us. She must not be troubled nor interfered with; “she hath done it for My burial;”—it was as impossible for her to help doing it now, as it was for her, or one very like her, to abstain from the like loving worship, when she first came to Me, loving much, and hoping, as far as she might dare hope, to have much forgiven;—as impossible as it will be within a few days for her not to wait on Me with spices and ointments, when I am to be laid in My grave;—“trouble her not,” “she hath done what she could;” “she hath wrought a good work on Me<sup>b</sup>.” And why was that work so significantly decreed to be spoken of throughout “the whole world,” but that all might understand that they could not go too far in loving, honouring, adoring that Body which He had vouchsafed to take into His divine Person, by which He was about to save the world, which was soon to endure such humiliation for our sake, as nothing could equal, save the glory to which it was afterwards to be visibly exalted for our perfect salvation?

<sup>a</sup> S. John viii. 58.

<sup>b</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 11.

CHAP. II. Moreover, in close connection with this comes another thought, indescribably fearful, as it seems to me, if we carry it out:—what manner of man he was who suggested to his fellow-disciples to have indignation and count it “waste,” as though too much were being made of Christ’s real, and then visible, Body, and the poor, His mystical body, were being robbed.

Others in their simplicity for a moment adopted the notion, but they presently received His correction; Judas, who had devised the scruple in hypocrisy, refusing to be corrected, (though never surely were such gracious warnings addressed to any one that we read of,) went out to commit the two most outrageous sins that could be committed against that blessed Body: first partaking of it with a heart and mind actually at the moment determined on betraying it, and so actually betraying it, as far as in him lay, to Satan, who forthwith entered into him; and afterwards, openly in the sight of man betraying it—betraying the Son of Man—by a kiss;—the loving penitent’s token of adoration was the hypocrite’s token of insult and unearthly malice.

And then, as if to prove that the holy Flesh which endured all this, and was about to endure much more, was still, as ever, the Temple of the divine glory; first, by shewing Himself, and declaring, “I am He,” He forced His assailants to recoil and fall to the ground, either on their faces in involuntary worship, or backwards as in despair. Presently afterwards He touched Malchus’ ear, and healed him. The cure was wrought by His touch, as in so many instances before. And since the man had been hurt in laying rude hands upon His Body, the healing may be received as a merciful token, that even unworthy communicants are not shut out from His mercy, and the benefit of the mysteries which they have profaned, except they persist in unworthiness.

§ 31. Then it was that our blessed Redeemer, withdrawing, as it were, His power into Himself, gave up His Body to the sacrifice, with the words, “This is your hour, and the power of darkness.” His disciples understood Him to signify that nothing more could be done for Him, and they might as well forsake Him and fly; His enemies, both on earth and in hell, knew that they were left to do their worst with Him;

and they did it unsparingly; and while His Body was, in CHAP. II. fact, winning the decisive and eternal victory for which He came into the world, it seemed to the eyes of men, perhaps of all creatures, to be surrendered, for good and all, to suffering and insult. But the first thing seen, when the preternatural darkness was over, and the light of day was again permitted to shine upon the cross and those standing by it, was the blood and water, flowing out from our Saviour's side, as soon as ever He was certainly known to be dead.

There is no need here to explain at large the symbolical and sacramental meaning of that miracle,—a meaning witnessed by all antiquity, and adopted by the Church of England especially in her office of Holy Baptism, where she declares that, “for the forgiveness of our sins, Christ shed out of His most precious side both Water and Blood.” “*His most precious side*.” the very phrase instinctively indicates what all devout persons have felt towards that sacred Form, drawn to it the more by this parting insult from those who were bent upon making themselves every way “guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour.”

We may perhaps realize those feelings most effectually, by reverently imagining how they may have begun in the heart and mind of the beloved disciple, chosen by the Holy Ghost to testify the transaction to us, and of the blessed Virgin, and other holy women; the special alarm and horror which they must have felt as they watched the brutal soldiery breaking the legs of the two malefactors, and approaching their Lord's cross with the same intent; the comparative relief when they saw that all that was done was ignorantly and wantonly to pierce His unconscious side; the awful sense of Divine interference and of Divine consolation, when, knowing that He was already dead, they saw the stream gush out, not of blood only, but of water and blood. Probably, indeed, it was in this instance as is noted elsewhere in S. John's Gospel: “These things understood not His disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that” His enemies “had done these things unto Him.” Yet the very tone

CHAP. II. of the narrative implies that even at that moment of exceeding grief and dismay, the Evangelist's mind—as often happens when dearest friends are departing—was deeply impressed with the circumstance, and would naturally go on wondering what it could mean. “He that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe<sup>d</sup>.” Perhaps it should be written “He knoweth,” for the Greek words (*καὶ κεῖνος οἶδεν*) will bear that construction; as though the historian were saying with S. Paul, “Behold, before God, I lie not.” But that it should be inserted with such an asseveration, calling such peculiar attention to it, in this which may be eminently called the theological Gospel,—for this, we might reverently conjecture, if we did not know, some deep theological reason must probably exist. As it is, the knowledge of the reason is vouchsafed to us; it is indicated in the Scripture quoted. The saying, “A bone of Him shall not be broken,” carries with it the sacrificial character of our Lord's Passion, that it was the very antitype of slaying the Paschal lamb. And again, “They shall look on Him whom they pierced” is the prophetic declaration of the mode of applying His Passion to the remission of His people's sins: the “piercing” is the opening of “a fountain for sin and for uncleanness;” and it is signified that it would not take full effect until the Lord had “poured out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications;” i.e. until a beginning had been given to Christian baptism by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles gathered on Mount Zion, and the setting up of the kingdom of heaven.

And the *rationale*, the principle of all this, is shadowed out in the farewell letter of the same Evangelist: “This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive

<sup>d</sup> S. John xix. 35.

the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this CHAP. II.  
is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son."

What is this threefold witness, this witness of God, on which the Apostle would thus unreservedly rest our faith? It is Jesus Christ, God incarnate, coming to His Church, and to each one of us, by water, by blood, and by His Spirit. To His whole Church He came by water, when, as the surety and representative of His people, He was baptized by S. John in Jordan; by blood, when He died on the cross; by His Spirit, on the Day of Pentecost. To each several child of Adam, whom He takes out of the world as one of His own, He comes by all three at once—by the Spirit, by water, and by blood,—in His two Sacraments, the one as well as the other: for water in Scripture signifies sanctification and cleansing; blood signifies satisfaction and atonement; and both these are, by His ordinance, in both the Sacraments, because in both the true gift is Participation of Christ, our life and our all, begun in Baptism, continued and growing in the Eucharist. And they are in the Sacraments by the special operation of His Spirit: "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is Truth." The Spirit is that Truth which both declares and makes them to be what they signify, as our Lord declared of one of them: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life;" the words in this case being, for the one, "This is My Body;" for the other, "I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And accordingly the Church, expressly or virtually, has always prayed for this descent of the Holy Ghost,—in Baptism, to "sanctify the water to the mystical washing away of sin;" in Holy Communion, according to the old Liturgies, to make the elements what our Lord declared them to be; according to our own Liturgy, to make us, receiving them, partakers of those holiest things.

To this doctrine, probably to expressions of it even then in liturgical use, the Apostle alludes more than once: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body<sup>e</sup>." And else-

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 13.

CHAP. II. where<sup>f</sup> the Church service is described partly by the use in it of Psalms and hymns in the way of response, (so we may best understand "speaking to yourselves,") partly by its involving a continual sacrifice of thanksgiving, and that for all, in the Name of Christ, to the Father,—a definition of a Christian Liturgy, as far as it goes, critically exact.

We may add the often-quoted passage in Rom. xv. 16: "That I might be a minister of Jesus Christ unto the Gentiles, doing a priest's work in respect of the Gospel of God<sup>g</sup>; that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost;" where S. Paul represents his calling as a missionary by an image borrowed from his other calling as a priest, the body of Gentile Christians being that which he had to offer, and requiring, in order to be acceptable, sanctification by the Holy Ghost, as the proper sacrifice of Christians did.

In a word, the patristical doctrine, that the Incarnation is not only applied, but extended as it were, by the blessed Sacraments, supplies the sufficient and only interpretation, both of the mysterious opening of the Redeemer's side on the cross, when He was in the sleep of death, and of that which is always referred to by antiquity as the ordained type of that circumstance in the Passion, the piercing of the first Adam's side in his sleep, and the formation or building up of that which was taken out of it into the first woman, his spouse, and the mother of us all.

And (it is a serious and alarming thought) if there be any who now scorn the doctrine, wilfully I mean, and in spite of helps to know better, we know for certain that they will not always scorn it. Holy Scripture tells of a moment to come, when that wound in our Lord's side, the fountain of Sacraments, and the door of life to us all, will be openly seen by all. "Every eye shall see Him, and they also who pierced Him:" even they who, by abusing His Sacrifice and Sacraments, shall have crucified and pierced Him afresh.

<sup>f</sup> "Speaking to yourselves in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father

in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ."  
—Eph. v. 19, 20.

<sup>g</sup> ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

The scar in His side will be to them an especial condemnation, as it will be a pledge of grace received and not wasted to all penitent and devout receivers. It is S. John again to whom this was revealed<sup>h</sup>; the disciple whom Jesus loved is throughout, by special Providence, the great teacher of the doctrine of His life-giving Body, and of the devotion due to it.

§ 32. But whatever beginnings of high and hopeful thought the miracle of the water and blood may have occasioned in S. John's mind, to the outward eye the blessed Body was still in the lowest and most pitiable condition,—in the hands of enemies, exposed to the worst indignities,—until the moment when Joseph of Arimathea begged it of Pilate. This must have been an hour or two after our Lord's death; for He gave up the Ghost at three, P.M., and, although the Sabbath did not begin until six, it seems that the taking down from the cross, the wrapping in linen clothes with the spices, and the entombment itself, had to be somewhat hastily performed. Some time, therefore, had probably elapsed between the piercing of Christ's side and the application of Joseph to Pilate; and since Nicodemus was near, a colleague of Joseph's, and known to have looked favourably on Christ, it is not perhaps exceeding the bounds of reasonable conjecture, if we suppose S. John to have applied to him, and through Him to Joseph, whose own new tomb was known to be near at hand, but who was not yet known for a disciple, as Nicodemus was, and therefore, perhaps, less obnoxious to the Pharisees. And so, between them, though, according to His condescension, our Lord's grave would have been "with the wicked," yet He was "with the rich in His death" and obsequies; unintentional testimony being thus borne by Pilate and others of His persecutors, that "He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth."

Whatever the process may have been, whether it originated with S. John or no, we know for certain that, from that moment forward, His true servants have never ceased to shew, in all possible ways, their entire devotion and love to that Blessed Body, enhanced beyond measure by all that they

<sup>h</sup> Rev. i. 7.

CHAP. II. were permitted to see and know of Its mysterious agonies; and never was one word uttered from above to stay or check them, or imply that they were going too far. When Cornelius fell down at S. Peter's feet to worship him, he was told, "Arise; I myself also am a man." When S. John did the like to the angel who was shewing him the heavenly vision, he was stopped by what, among men, would have been an exclamation of religious horror: "See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God<sup>1</sup>." But nowhere in Holy Scripture will you find anything at all answering to this in respect of the worship and reverence shewn to Christ's Body, as if it were possible to exaggerate or carry it too far; not one letter or syllable to interrupt or moderate the deep devotion of the Church for all these centuries that she has remained, with the beloved disciple, standing by the Cross, and with adoring love and wonder contemplating the blood and water as it flows from His pierced side; seeing it, and bearing record,—and her record is true, and she knoweth that she saith true, that we all might believe.

What, indeed, is the history of the three days of Christ's burial, and of the forty days after His resurrection, but a course of solemn acts of worship to His real Bodily Presence, offered on His servants' part and accepted on His own?

There are Joseph and Nicodemus, and the holy women, laying Him in the grave with their myrrh and spices, such as they knew that the Holy Ghost, by the prophets, had appointed to be offered to the KING'S SON.

There are the Maries coming to the sepulchre in the early morning to complete their religious purpose, and she first who loved best: and they have a great reward—they are permitted to be the first to see His risen Body, and hear His voice; and as soon as they see and hear, they worship; and so (as has been often noted) they obtain the privilege of preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection to the very Apostles themselves.

There is S. John, who by his presence beneath the Cross, and when our Lord's side was pierced, may be supposed

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xix. 10.

to have learned deeper thoughts of the prerogatives of His Body than were yet familiar to any of the rest. As he was first of the Apostles at the sepulchre, so was he first to believe without seeing, and to recognise our Lord appearing suddenly at a distance<sup>k</sup>; even as many years afterwards he knew Him by sight through all His glory in the heavens, in the midst of the golden candlesticks, and on the cloud of judgment, discerning "one like unto the Son of Man<sup>l</sup>." Certainly it is a remarkable fact, that the two most noted and most highly-favoured for their special love of our Lord, the Magdalen and the beloved disciple, should thus be marked out for their especial devotion to His Body.

Then there is His sudden appearance on the road to the two disciples, and His no less sudden vanishing out of their sight, just as their eyes were opened, and they had come to know Him in the act of breaking of bread; a history, the significancy of which in our present argument surely needs no elucidation; as neither do the circumstances of His last appearance that evening,—the entry through the closed doors, the real Body with Its real scars, and Its real participation of meat with them, at the same time that It was visibly breathing His own and His Father's Spirit into their hearts, and audibly giving them that commission which none could give but He that is equal with the Father. Who does not feel, as he reads or hears, a deepening veneration and inward worship of the holy Humanity of Him who thus spake and acted? How much more those who saw Him all along with their eyes! who "looked upon" Him, and "handled with their hands" Him who is "the Word of Life<sup>m</sup>!"

A week more, and the doubts of S. Thomas are removed by the touch of the holy Body with Its scars, or rather, by that permission to touch It, whereby the timid Apostle might discern the omniscience of the speaker. With confirmed faith he makes his confession, the very confession of devout communicants in all ages,—“It is my Lord and my God.” Observe the answer he received,—a blessing, not so immediately for himself as for us, whose trial is, that the same Lord and Christ, the same Son of God Incarnate, is present

<sup>k</sup> S. John xxi. 7.<sup>l</sup> Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14.<sup>m</sup> 1 S. John i. 1.

CHAP. II. with us, and permits us to touch Him, as really indeed, but invisibly, and in a different kind of presence. "Blessed are they now, and blessed shall they all be hereafter, who shall believe and worship as thou now dost, without waiting for the actual sight, which has at last convinced thee." These are not words to make a Christian afraid of believing too much of his Lord's Presence in Holy Communion, or of adoring Him too earnestly.

§ 33. Rather it might perhaps not untruly be said, that one apparent purpose of our Lord's abode upon earth during those forty days was, that He might inure them to the faith and contemplation of a certain Presence of His now spiritualized Body among them, occasional only, and in the highest degree mysterious, but in itself most real and blessed, and associated with all the best gifts and fruits of His Incarnation—the evidence and conveyance of the eternal life to which He had risen. This Presence the sacred narrative (we may almost say) studiously connects with the meals which He took with them; as at Emmaus, as He sat at meat with them, He took the loaf, and blessed, and brake and gave to them, recalling to their very eyes the miracle of the five thousand and its antitype—the greater miracle of the Eucharist. The same day, at evening, having shewn them "His hands and His feet, while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And He took it, and did eat before them<sup>n</sup>." The following Sunday, as it may seem, He appeared unto the eleven (Thomas having now taken his place among them) "as they sat at meat." The remarkable appearance and miracle at the sea of Galilee, related in the last chapter of the last Gospel, and considered by S. Augustine<sup>o</sup> as exhibiting a kind of link or transition from Christ's earthly to His heavenly kingdom, had for its visible and immediate occasion the present hunger and destitution of the disciples. They had caught nothing that night; the morning light

<sup>n</sup> S. Luke xxiv. 40—43.

<sup>o</sup> In S. Joan. Evang. Tr. 122:—"Narratur hic quemadmodum se manifestaverit Dominus ad mare Tiberia-

dis, et in captura piscium commendaverit Ecclesiæ Sacramentum, qualis futura est ultima resurrectione mortuorum."

shewed Him to them standing on the shore, but not, as yet, recognised by them. He inquires of them, "Children, have ye any meat?" They answer, No. He tells them where to cast their net; they obey, and in a moment it is full of great fishes; and not only so, but, before they could land any of these, their condescending Lord had provided for them "a fire of coals, and fish laid thereon, and bread;" and His word is to them, "Come and dine;" or, in more modern language, "Take your morning meal." Then, and not before, the disciples knew that it was the Lord. It was the third time of His shewing Himself to any number of them together, and each time had been at a meal.

The whole transaction looked back, as it were, not only to the similar miracle, the former extraordinary draught of fishes provided for the same persons on the same waters, but also to the two instances of supernatural feeding, when the hunger of those coming to Christ was satisfied by a few loaves and fishes. And did it not look forward also to the state of things shortly to take place in the Church? how that in our spiritual toil and hunger He would shew Himself to us by glimpses of His blessed Body; standing on the shore, i. e. Heaven, and calling on us from time to time to partake of the heavenly food He hath provided for us, until the whole Church, the net full of great fishes, a hundred and fifty and three, (the perfect number of the elect,) be drawn after Him to the land, and the Bridegroom, with them that are ready, go in finally to the marriage-feast.

Perhaps it was not without meaning of this kind that the Holy Ghost, describing the intercourse of Christ with His disciples during those forty days, selected a word which, in its proper signification, stands for "eating salt with them"; i. e. partaking of their meals. Forty days, in the symbolical language of Scripture, would represent the whole time of the Church's probation, until the day come in which she shall ascend with her Lord: and then His eating salt with her must be His presence at the celebration of the great sacrificial feast of the new covenant, which He, in His unspeakable condescension, accounts Himself partaker of with us; as when

CHAP. II. He says, "I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God<sup>a</sup>;" "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God<sup>r</sup>." For His "meat is to do" His "Father's will, and to finish His work<sup>s</sup>;" and where on earth is the Father's will and work more perfectly found than in holy and devout Communion? There, if any where on this side heaven, is the "very image of" those "good things to come," which the gracious Lord encourages us to look on to in those words of unutterable condescension, "Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that He shall gird Himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them<sup>t</sup>."

§ 34. Then came the day of the Lord's Ascension, when His natural but now glorified Body was to go up to His Father's right hand, there to abide, in its visible form and substance, until the times of restitution of all things. As they saw His Body in the act of departing, "they worshipped<sup>u</sup>;" He left them prostrate, or on their knees. Very strange it would have seemed to them, had they been told that His sacred Body was the less to be worshipped because it is now glorified, and must wear a veil over it to be endured by mortal sight. And when the Holy Comforter had come down upon them, and they were admitted fully into the kingdom of heaven; besides their knowledge, now made perfect, of all doctrine connected with the Ascension, they would find, in the visible prerogatives with which both themselves and others through them were endowed, fresh reasons every hour for magnifying the holy Humanity of Christ, divinely ordained to be all in all to them. For by their communion with Him through His Spirit, as His chosen and select witnesses, chief members of His mystical Body, the works that He had done they were enabled to do also; and for the more confirmation of this union, they were authorized to use the very words and gestures which their Lord had commonly employed in His miracles of healing. This

<sup>a</sup> S. Luke xxii. 16.<sup>r</sup> S. Mark xiv. 25.<sup>s</sup> S. John iv. 34.<sup>t</sup> S. Luke xii. 37.<sup>u</sup> S. Luke xxiv. 32.

began with the very beginning of the Church, on the Day of Pentecost; but the first instance particularly recorded is the healing of the lame man by S. Peter, in which there is the same combination of the divine Touch and the divine Word as in the majority of our Lord's own miracles, and also in the outward and visible parts of His Sacraments: the Touch, in that the Apostle took the patient "by the right hand and lifted him up;" the Word, in his saying, "In the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." So we read afterwards, that "by the *hands* of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people;" that Ananias laid his hands upon Saul, and he recovered his sight; that S. Peter gave Tabitha his hand to complete her recovery after he had wakened her from death, besides saying, "Tabitha, arise;" that S. Paul, upon the sudden death of Eutychus, went down, and fell on him, and embraced him, saying, "Trouble not yourselves, for his life is in him;" recalling the remembrance of what Elijah and Elisha had done, and intimating to thoughtful persons the typical significance of their history, (and that miracle, we may observe, took place during a celebration of the holy Eucharist: lastly, in Melita he cured a fever by prayer and laying on of hands.

Moreover, from the members, as from the Head, of the Church, it was noticed that the healing virtue did, as it were, overflow, communicating itself to their garments, and those even apart from their persons. From Paul's body "were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." And in Acts v., still more remarkably, "they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them." The exceptions also to the rule of healing by touch appear to be of the same kind as those which have been noted in the Gospel history: they are, the casting out devils; the infliction of punishments, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and of Elymas; special faith, affirmed in the case of the cripple at Lystra, and im-

<sup>x</sup> Acts v. 12.

<sup>y</sup> Acts iii. 6.

CHAP. II. plied in that of *Æneas*; and all in that one only Name, whereby it might be known without question that Christ is the only Healer, as He is known to be the only Baptizer and the only Consecrator. Who can doubt that the effect of all this was still to deepen men's reverence and gratitude towards the awful and blessed Body which they knew to be the fountain of it all? which Body, be it noticed, was every day presented before them in a sacramental way in the holy Eucharist; for in the mother Church of Jerusalem, at least, we know that they "continued daily in breaking of bread."

§ 35. We may perhaps not unfitly close this series of scriptural facts by noticing that it is the Lamb which is selected, rather than the Lion, or any other animal, as that symbol of our Lord which may most meetly represent Him in His celestial estate, all through the Book of Revelations; in part, doubtless, for the same reason that the Cross is His chosen standard among inanimate things, and the Son of Man His chosen title: that wherein He abases Himself most, and is most evil spoken of, therein He may receive especial glory.

And the general result of the survey comes, I think, undeniably, to as much as this—that every where such encouragement is given to the worship of our Lord in His human nature, made adorable by its union with the Divine, as to create a strong probability, at least, that such worship would not be forbidden, but rather sanctioned and enjoined, in that Sacrament which, rather than any thing else, is the standing monument of the Incarnation, and extension of it.

§ 36. And such, in fact, is the case, as a very few words will shew. Worship is a personal thing; the true, real, primary object of worship, in the proper and high sense of the word, for all reasonable and understanding creatures, must of course be some person, and that Person the Most High God. On this point there is no need of any abstract discussion; it is settled for us at once on the very highest authority: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." The Person therefore of Jesus Christ our Lord, wherever it is, is to be adored—to be honoured,

acknowledged, sought unto, depended on, with all possible reverence, with the most entire and single-hearted devotion, incommunicable to any finite being—by all creatures whom He has brought to know Him. This proposition, though in the heat of theological warfare it may seem to have been denied, and that recently, cannot, I conceive, be really and advisedly denied by any one who believes the Divinity of our Lord. Taking it for granted, I will state it once again. The Person of Jesus Christ our Lord, wherever it is, is to be adored. And now I will add the next proposition in the argument, viz. Christ's Person is in the holy Eucharist by the presence of His Body and Blood therein. From which, as will be seen, follows, by direct inference, that the Person of Christ is to be adored in that Sacrament, as there present in a peculiar manner, by the presence of His Body and Blood.

It is on the second or minor of these three propositions, if on any, that opposition is to be expected, and explanation is necessary. It raises, evidently, the whole question of that which is denominated "the real objective Presence" of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist. That is to say, whereas the Divine nature in Christ is everywhere and always equally present, and so everywhere and always alike adorable; but to us frail children of men He has condescended at certain times and places to give *especial tokens* of His Presence, which it is our duty to recognise, and then especially to adore: thus far, I suppose, all allow who in any sense believe the Creeds of the Church, that in the holy Eucharist we are very particularly bound to take notice of His *divine* Presence, as GOD THE WORD, and to worship Him accordingly. That which some in modern times have denied is, that He is then and there present *according to His human nature*, really and substantially present, as truly present as He was to any of those with whom He conversed when He went in and out among us; or again, as He is now present in heaven interceding for us. Both of these two last mentioned are modes of His human Presence, acknowledged by all who confess Him come in the flesh. But that which some affirm, some deny, as part of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, is a third and special mode of Presence of the holy Humanity of our Lord, denoted

CHAP. II. and effected by His own words—"This is My Body, this is My Blood;" a Presence the manner of which is beyond all thought, much more beyond all words of ours, but which those who believe it can no more help adoring, than they could have helped it had they been present with S. Thomas, to see in His hands the print of the nails; or, again, with so many sick persons to touch the hem of His garment, and so to be made whole. It is no more natural for them to think, one way or the other, of worshipping the Bread and Wine, than it was for the woman with the issue of blood to think of worshipping the garment which she touched, instead of Him who was condescending to wear it and make it an instrument of blessing to her.

If we may reverently say it, (using an illustration which is applied by the Church to a subject, if possible, still more awful than this,) "as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man," and as "God and Man is one Christ," so the consecrated Bread and Wine, and the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, are one Sacrament. And as we know the soul of a man, which we cannot see, to be present by the presence of his living body, which we can see, so the presence of that Bread and Wine is to us a sure token of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood. We are not more certain of the one by our reliance on God's ordinary providence, than we are of the other by our faith in Christ's own word. And as persons of common sense are not apt to confound a man's soul with his body, because of the intimate and mysterious connection of the two,—(to bring men to that requires either extreme subtilty or extreme grossness of understanding);—nor yet can you easily bring them to doubt whether meat and drink serve to keep the two together, whether life can come by bread, because they cannot understand how,—so no plain and devout reader of Holy Scripture and disciple of the Church would, of his own accord, find a difficulty in adoring the thing signified, apart from the outward sign or form; or in believing that the one may surely convey the other by a spiritual and heavenly process, known to God, but unknown to him, and to all on earth.

§ 37. It is not the object of these papers to reason out at

large that great, and comfortable, and (I will add) necessary truth, known to the faithful under the name of "the Real Presence," but rather to point out the inseparable connection between it and the practice of adoration. But I must here borrow so much from the premisses of that argument as to assume that the sixth chapter of S. John really and primarily relates to the Sacrament of Holy Communion; according to the well-known interpretation of Hooker, which is the interpretation of all antiquity, and lies so obviously on the surface of Scripture, that one can hardly conceive a simple, unlearned reader giving any other turn to the discourse in that chapter, unless he were prepossessed by a theory.

Allowing, then, that, as Hooker alleges, the Apostles at the Last Supper could not but understand the sayings and doings of our Lord as the intended fulfilment of His typical miracle and prophetic sayings a twelvemonth before, let us calmly consider what doctrine about Holy Communion they must have taught and believed, from that day forward, or at least from the day of His coming upon them Who was to bring all Christ's sayings to remembrance. They must have believed that, as ordinary food and drink are necessary to ordinary temporal life, so His Body and Blood, sacramentally received, are necessary to spiritual life; for "except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you:"—that as a common meal, with God's blessing upon it, has a virtue to keep us alive for a certain time, so this heavenly meal has the like virtue in respect to the life everlasting; for "whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life:"—that it has a certain special quality of preparing our bodies for the general resurrection; for "I will raise him up at the last day;"—that ordinary food and drink is but the shadow of this, the true Bread from heaven, and the fruit of the true Vine, in the same kind of way that Christ is the true Light, and this material light but a figure of Him; heaven the true riches, of which the earthly mammon is but a coarse and unreal image; and all other Gospel antitypes far more real and substantial than their legal or natural types: for which cause, mainly, (as I suppose,) Christ

CHAP. II. is called the *Truth*, in contradistinction to Mosaical shadows; so that in the Sacrament we eat and drink more really and substantially than on any other occasion:—all this they might gather from the saying, "For My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed."

Again, they would understand that His Flesh and Blood in Holy Communion is the special means appointed by Him, not for beginning, but for continuing, spiritual life,—the instrument whereby the members adhere to their Head,—as well as the remedial token and pledge whereby they know that they are very members incorporate in Him, and not yet cast off for their many backslidings; for "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." Finally, to set the most awful seal to the greatness and reality of all this,—to put down for ever the notion that He was merely using figures of speech,—the Holy Ghost caused them to remember that our Lord had said, "As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me <sup>a</sup>."

§ 38. And for a key to the whole mysterious transaction, so far as man might comprehend it, He had introduced the title, Son of Man, three times in the course of the conversation, and apparently just at those points of it where it would come in most significantly, supposing His intention to be to intimate thereby the office of the Sacrament in extending and applying the benefit of His Incarnation.

First, in leading His hearers to the whole subject, He had said, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: for Him hath God the Father sealed<sup>b</sup>." Him the Father had "sanctified and sent into the world," anointing His holy Manhood with the Holy Ghost and with power without measure, for this especial purpose, that He, being the Son of Man, might give you the meat that endureth unto everlasting life.

Secondly; when, in His gracious disclosures, keeping even time (so to speak) with the stubborn and insolent answers of the Jews, He had arrived at that saying, so offensive to the

<sup>a</sup> S. John vi. 57.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 27.

ear and heart of philosophy falsely so called, "The Bread CHAP. II. that I will give is My Flesh;" it began, as soon as spoken, to be a cause of strife: for in regard of this doctrine especially has the saying ever been too truly fulfilled, "I came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword." And accordingly the Jews, at the very first hearing of it, began to strive with one another, saying, "How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?" Whereupon our Lord, in repeating it, with the addition that they must drink His Blood, was careful to point out to them that it was the Flesh and Blood of the Son of Man: "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." As Son of Man, He had decreed to bestow on them His Flesh and Blood, that it might be within them, to be the very life of their souls.

Once more, when the trial and agony caused by the "hard saying"<sup>c</sup> seemed at the keenest, in His prophetic mercy and pity He warned them of an event which would make it harder still: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" He accompanied the warning with a significant repetition of the title, Son of Man; which, when the time was come, His disciples would understand to imply that His going up to heaven bodily, in His human nature, was indeed a most essential link in the chain of wonders which began with His Incarnation. His work as Son of Man would be very incomplete without it; He could neither sit as a King on His Father's right hand in heaven, "until His enemies be made His footstool," nor stand before Him, either there or in earth, as "a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Since the commemorative Sacrifice in heaven was necessary for the efficacy of the Eucharist offered on earth,—which, indeed, is only efficacious by being joined to the oblation above,—the Communion, however blessed a thing, cannot be understood as having done all its work before the glorious Ascension of our Lord. Mary must not touch Christ, because He hath "not yet ascended to His Father," to send down, as the first-fruits of His priestly office in heaven, the Holy Spirit, by Whose regenerating power mortals might be united to Him, and made worthy to touch

<sup>c</sup> S. John vi. 52, 53.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. 60.

CHAP. II. Him spiritually. Such is S. Cyril's exposition of that mysterious saying, "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father." And if any one hesitate to accept it, as inconsistent with our Lord's offering His Body, as He did so often, to the touch of His disciples during those forty days, he may consider that such permission was granted, by way of miraculous evidence, to such as were yet imperfect in the faith of the Resurrection; whereas the blessed Magdalene seems to have had no doubt, but only wanted to kiss His feet, as before His death, in loving adoration. Her touch would represent the ordinary approach of believers to Christ's Body in the holy Eucharist, and should therefore be deferred until she had been purified by the Holy Ghost.

To return for a moment to His own words in the sixth chapter: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" Understood in this connection, they do in a wonderful manner intimate the three great mysterious Unities comprised in the idea of Christian redemption: first, the Unity of the Father and the Son, implied in "where He was before;" next, the Unity of God and Man in the Person of Christ, implied in the title, Son of Man; thirdly, the Union and Communion between Christ and His saints, in that partaking of His Body and Blood is here connected with His Ascension. And in the next verse He turns our thoughts towards that other Divine Person, Who, as Holy Scripture informs us, is in some heavenly way the bond and principle of each of these divine unities. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." The Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, of whom the Church says<sup>e</sup> that in His unity the Son liveth and reigneth with the Father; and whom our Lord, speaking to the Father, seems in one place to entitle, "The Love wherewith Thou hast loved Me<sup>f</sup>;" by Whose power, overshadowing the blessed Virgin, the Godhead and Manhood were united for ever in Christ:—He it is that quickeneth the souls and bodies of men dead in trespasses and sins: He also (so our Lord seems to speak) shall descend upon the earthly creatures which I by My priests shall bless, and cause them to be the Flesh and Blood of the

<sup>e</sup> Collect for Whitsunday.

<sup>f</sup> S. John xvii. ult.

Son of Man, life eternal to those who go on worthily receiving them. "The flesh profiteth nothing:" not even the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, could you conceive it separated from His divine Person and Spirit,—much less the Bread and Wine used as a charm,—could ever do your souls any good: any such superstition or witchcraft could only come of this earth, or worse; but "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." CHAP. II.

But whatever turn may be given to this verse in particular, surely there is nothing in the above-mentioned way of stating the general drift of that chapter of S. John, but what the words will very well admit of: and the mere statement of it shews sufficiently what an exact analogy it bears to the Scriptural accounts of the other portions of the divine process of salvation,—how naturally it finds its place among them.

§ 39. Now to apply all this to the question of adoration: is the PERSON of Christ, God and Man, present in the holy Eucharist by this transcendental Presence of His Body and Blood? The affirmative seems distinctly proved by His own words in the same discourse; in that He more than once interchanges the first personal pronoun, I, Me, &c., with the phrases, "This bread, My flesh," &c. I will not dwell on the 32nd and 33rd verses<sup>a</sup>, which in our English translation would seem to exemplify this; for it may be that the sentence which is rendered, "The Bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world," should rather be rendered "*that* which cometh down from heaven;" although the word "giveth" strongly suggests the idea of a *person* acting, and is distinctly so employed throughout the New Testament, with two exceptions only, and those of a poetical cast: "the moon shall not give her light;" and, "the heavens gave rain<sup>b</sup>."

But be this as it may, two verses further on our Lord distinctly identifies the Bread of Life with His own Person: "I am the Bread of Life<sup>c</sup>." And so the Jews understood

<sup>a</sup> Ὁ Πατήρ μου ἔδωκεν τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν ἀληθινάν. Ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ

τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ζωὴν δίδους τῇ κόσμῳ.

<sup>b</sup> S. Matt. xxiv. 29; S. James v. 18.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 35: cf. II. 48—51.

Him, for they murmured at His saying, "I am the Bread which came down from heaven;" and He, instead of correcting, confirms their thought, re-asserting more unequivocally, more at large, and in a more startling form, the truth at which they had taken offence, and leaving it with them, and with all his hearers, to be an occasion of falling to the one sort, a wholesome exercise of faith to the other. "I am that Bread of Life," He repeats; "I, in My Person, Jesus Christ, God and Man." "Of Life:" in that while "your fathers did eat manna," which was called "Bread from heaven," "and are dead, this is the Bread that cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." Then, as if to preclude the notion that the bread He was speaking of was any mere gift of His, anything short of participation of His very Self, He proceeds to qualify that Bread as *living*, and as *having come down* from heaven: "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven;" not *life-giving* only, but *living*; not here *καταβαλὼν*, but *καταβάς*,—i. e. not (as in the preceding verse) coming, as it were, mystically down, from time to time, on each sacramental occasion, but having once for all come down by the wonderful Incarnation; on which descent plainly depends the word of promise immediately following: "If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever." And to complete the statement, and bring the Sacrament which He was to institute into closest connection with His own Incarnate Person, He subjoins, "And the Bread, moreover, (*καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ*) which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (The *δὲ*, which in this phrase indicates the insertion of a new circumstance in the statement, is overlooked in our version.) His Flesh, then, in this argument is plainly Himself, and the sacramental Presence, oblation, and participation of the one are respectively those of the other.

The same is again implied (may we not say, clearly asserted?) in the concluding portion of the dialogue. "Whoso (v. 54) eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day;" is repeated (v. 57) in this form: "He that eateth *Me*, even he shall live by *Me*." The "*Me*" in this sentence is clearly equivalent to "*My Flesh*" in the former one. Therefore such as eat

His Flesh and drink His Blood worthily in Holy Communion CHAP. II.  
are indeed partakers of the Son of God by a true supernatural union, and derive from Him eternal life; as really as He is partaker of the Father by that ineffable, incommunicable Sonship, and being for ever God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God,—the Second Person, not the First,—derives from Him, who is the First, life and being, and all that He hath; and is God, not by adoption, but by eternal generation. What man or Angel durst have spoken such a word? but now it is put into our mouths by the Creator of men and Angels, and we dare not refrain from speaking it.

Therefore, again, (how can we help the conclusion? and why should we shrink from it?) where His Flesh and Blood are, there is He by a peculiar and personal Presence of His holy Humanity; and being there,—being, as First-begotten, so brought continually into “the habitable parts of His earth,” according to the “delight” which He has in being “with the sons of men,”—He must needs be adorable, both by the holy Angels and by the children of men themselves, whom He comes to quicken and to bless for ever.

§ 40. The points on which this argument turns are expressed in few and well-known words by S. Ambrose, near the end of his Tract on the Mysteries, not as his own teaching, but as the teaching of the Church\*. First, of the real and substantial Presence after Consecration thus he writes:

“The Lord Jesus Himself cries out, *This is My Body*. Before benediction by the heavenly words, it is named by the name of another kind of thing; after consecration it is signified to be a Body. He Himself calls it ‘His own Blood.’ Before consecration it is called something else; after consecration, its style and title is Blood. And thou sayest, *Amen*; that is, it is true. What the mouth speaketh, let the mind inwardly confess; what the discourse utters, the same let the heart feel.”

Next, as to the Presence being personal, by reason of the Presence of His Body:—“The Church, beholding so great grace, exhorts her children, exhorts all around her, to run

\* § 54—58.

CHAP. II. together to her Sacraments, saying, *Eat, ye who are nearest unto Me, and drink, and be inebriated, O my brethren*<sup>1</sup>. What we eat, what we drink, the Holy Spirit in another place hath explained to thee by the prophet, saying, *O taste and see that the Lord is sweet: blessed is the man who trusteth in Him*<sup>m</sup>." Here the Psalmist is interpreted as signifying that what we taste is the Lord Himself: for S. Ambrose proceeds, "In that Sacrament is Christ, because it is the Body of Christ." And then he warns us,—in words corresponding to our Lord's cautionary saying,—“It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the Flesh profiteth nothing;” that for this very reason, “*because it is the Body of Christ,*” it is “not bodily food, but spiritual. Wherefore also the Apostle saith of that which is a type of it, that *our Fathers did eat spiritual meat, and drink spiritual drink*. For the Body of God is a spiritual Body; the Body of Christ is the Body of a Divine Spirit: for Christ is a Spirit . . . I may add, that it is our *heart* which this meat ‘strengthens,’ and this drink ‘maketh glad the heart of man;’ as the prophet points out” in the 104th Psalm.

What was the opinion of S. Ambrose, or rather what his testimony is to the belief and practice of the whole Church in his time, touching the adoration of Christ sacramentally present, will appear by-and-by.

§ 41. But the Scriptural argument for it is yet very far from being exhausted. The Word of God presents to us the Sacrament of the Eucharist under another, a sacrificial, aspect: which must be considered, if the truth is adequately to be told concerning either the Real Presence, or the adoration claimed for it. The Eucharist, as the Fathers speak, is the unbloody Sacrifice of the New Testament; unbloody, though it be in part an offering of blood: *ἀναιμακτός*, not *ἀναιμος*. No blood shed in it, but the living Blood of Christ with His living Body offered up to the Father, for a memorial of the real blood-shedding, the awful and painful Sacrifice once for all offered on the Cross.

This memorial Christ offers in heaven, night and day, to

<sup>1</sup> Cantic. v. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Ps. xxxiv. 9.

God the Father: His glorified Body, with all its wounds, His Blood which He poured out on the cross, but on His resurrection took again to Himself, and with it ascended into heaven. With that Body and Blood He appears continually before the throne, by it making intercession for us; by it reminding God the Father of His one oblation of Himself once offered on the cross: as S. John writes, "We have an Advocate," one to plead for us, "with the Father, and He is the Propitiation for our sins." Thus He is our Aaron first, and then our Melchisedec; the virtue of His perpetual advocacy depending on His former propitiation. Both ways He is "a Priest for ever."

§ 42. But to enter on a regular exposition of this great evangelical truth would involve a detailed commentary on large portions of Holy Scripture, and the whole system of ancient sacrifices would have to be thoroughly and minutely analysed. For the present undertaking it will suffice if we can shew,

First, that the doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice is involved in the very words of institution, and is of course inseparable from the true meaning and right use of the Sacrament. In which argument it will incidentally appear that the English Liturgy in particular is full of the same doctrine.

Secondly, that there are large portions of the New Testament which cannot be explained without assuming it.

And as we go along, we shall see how evidently the fact of Christ's Eucharistical Priesthood implies the duty of constantly adoring Him in the Eucharist.

§ 43. First, then, of the Words of Institution, and the turn given to them in our Communion Office.

The places, it is true, are not many, but they are deeply significant. The key-words in them (so to speak) are such as *remembrance*, *memory*, *memorial*, all which refer us of course to one of the words of institution: "Do this in remembrance of Me;" εἰς τὴν ἔμνην ἀνάμνησιν. The word ἀνάμνησις is a sacrificial word, as may be seen in Leviticus ii., and elsewhere, as well as the kindred word μνημόσυνον; and when so applied, means always "a portion of something offered to Almighty God, to remind Him" of the worshipper

CHAP. II. himself, or of some other person or object in whom the worshipper takes an interest; or of His own loving-kindness, shewn by mercies past or gracious promises for the future.

Such memorial offerings in sacrifice are like the memorial words in prayer: e. g., "Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, Thy servants<sup>n</sup>;" "Remember me, O my God, for good<sup>o</sup>." Or like that which is the conclusion of almost all the collects which we address to God the Father,—“through Jesus Christ our Lord.” That short form is in words what the Christian memorial Sacrifice is in act and deed; pleading with the Father by Christ crucified; presenting to Him the Body and Blood of His Incarnate Son, with all His wounds, and all His merits and mercies, that in Him and by Him we may be accepted; that the remedy provided for all may be applied to, and taken by, each one in particular. This is the proper drift of the word *remembrance* in our Lord’s institution of the Sacrament. “Do this;” He seems to say, “Bless, break, distribute, receive, this Bread; bless, distribute, drink of this Cup; say over the two respectively, ‘This is My Body, this is My Blood;’ in order to that memorial sacrifice which properly belongs to Me; the memorial which My servants are continually to make of Me, among one another, and before My Father.” Not, of course, as though He could forget, or needed, like the heathen idols, to have His attention recalled to His worshippers, (as Elijah said of Baal, “He sleepeth, and must be awaked;”)—far be it from any Christian to charge his brethren with such an unworthy superstitious notion; but as it is with the omniscient God in the matter of prayer, so in this matter of sacrifice. He knoweth what we have need of before we ask, yet He willeth us to ask: so He might without any offering of ours apply to us the benefits of our Lord’s Sacrifice, but it hath pleased Him to ordain this way of memorial sacrifice,—a most blessed way for us, in that we are hereby permitted to join in that very same memorial of our dear Lord’s Death and Passion, which He is now and always making of it within the true holy of holies, and before the true mercy-seat.

<sup>n</sup> Exod. xxxii. 13; Isa. lxiv. 9.

<sup>o</sup> Nehem. xiii. 31; Ps. lxxiv. 2, 18; Ps. lxxix. 8.

§ 44. Theologians, indeed, have not seldom said that the Christian dispensation has no standing sacrifice, properly so called: thus Hooker, "The Fathers of the Church of Christ call usually the ministry of the Gospel *priesthood*, in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely, the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice<sup>p</sup>." This passage undoubtedly does *in words* contradict the saying that the Eucharist is the "Christian Sacrifice;" but on second thoughts it may, perhaps, be found substantially to assert the doctrine contained in that saying. "The Gospel," he says, "hath properly now no sacrifice;" i. e., no such sacrifice as had been mentioned just before, under the title of "ancient sacrifices;" no material offering solemnly ordained for the known ends of sacrifices. This we all grant; it is the very same statement which the same Fathers were in the habit of making, when they were explaining the principles of Christianity to the heathen, so far as their rule permitted. Take, for instance, the words which Prudentius puts into the mouth of the martyr Romanus<sup>q</sup>:—

"Cognostis Ipsum; nunc colendi agnoscite  
Ritum modumque: quale sit templi genus,  
Quæ dedicari sanxerit donaria,  
Quæ vota poseat, quos sacerdotes velit,  
Quod mandet illie nectar immolarier.  
Ædem sibi Ipse mente in hominis condidit; . . .  
Illie sacerdos stat sacrato in limine,  
Foresque primas virgo custodit . . .  
Pascit litari victimas Christo et Patri, . .  
Frontis pudorem, cordis innocentiam,  
Dei timorem, regulam scientiæ,  
Pacis quietem, castitatem corporis. . . .  
Ex his amœnus hostiis surgit vapor, . .  
Et prosperatum dulce delectat Deum."

Did Prudentius and others by these and the like sayings imply that sacrifice is no part of the Christian ministry in any sense? surely not.

Prudentius flourished in the latter half of the fifth century;

<sup>p</sup> Eccl. Pol., v. 78.

<sup>q</sup> Περὶ στεφάνων, x. 311.

CHAP. II. a time in which there can be no doubt of the prevalence of the sacrificial view of the Eucharist over the whole Church. All will allow that the language to which Hooker refers as usual in the Fathers, was by that time at least universally employed, both in liturgies, and in homilies, and other religious compositions. One short sentence in an epistle of S. Augustine and other African Fathers to Pope S. Innocent I. may be taken as a key to their doctrine: "Melchisedec by bringing forth the sacramental sign of the Lord's Table, was instructed how to prefigure His eternal Priesthood<sup>r</sup>." How can this be reconciled with repudiation of altars and sacrifices in the statements before-mentioned? In this way, if I mistake not,—that the true oblation in the Christian Sacrifice is in no sense earthly or material. It is altogether spiritual: the chief of those spiritual sacrifices in the offering whereof consists the common priesthood of us all. The Eucharist comprehends them all in one, and has besides, peculiar to itself, that which alone causes any of them to be acceptable. For the true oblation in the Eucharist is not the Bread and Wine,—that is only as the vessel which contains or the garment which veils it;—but that which our Lord by the hands of the priest offers to His Father in the holy Eucharist, is His own Body and Blood, the very same which He offers and presents to Him,—with which, as S. Paul says<sup>s</sup>, He appears before Him *now*, night and day continually—in heaven, in commemoration of His having offered it once for all in His Passion and Death on the Cross. It is the one great reality, summing up in itself all the memorial sacrifices of old. In the Christian scheme, it is "proportionable" to them; and of course it stands in the same rank and relation to them, as the other antitypes in the Gospel to their several types and shadows in the law.

The memorial therefore made of Christ before the Father in Holy Communion, is as much more real, more glorious, more blessed, than all the memorial sacrifices of old;—than the yearly paschal lamb, for instance;—as the one atoning Sacrifice on the Cross surpassed the lamb slain at the first Passover; as the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost

<sup>r</sup> Ap. St. Aug., Ep. cxxxvii. 12.

<sup>s</sup> Heb. ix. 24.

surpassed the fire on the burnt-offering; as Christ is more glorious than Aaron or Melchisedec; heaven, with the tree of life and the waters of life, more blessed than the land flowing with milk and money; the new Jerusalem more true and real than the old. He who thinks most highly, and therefore least inadequately, of that holy and divine Sacrament, cannot well say, or conceive, any thing of it higher than this,—that it is, in the strict sense of the word, “that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices<sup>†</sup>.”

Therefore let no person apprehend that in teaching and magnifying the Eucharistic Sacrifice he is really contradicting this great authority; any more than, to name a kindred point, he need think himself departing *in principle* from Hooker’s mind by maintaining the Real objective Presence after consecration. For it is very plain that Hooker’s scruple arose not from any dread of so-called superstition, as though too much were being attributed to sacraments, but from jealousy in behalf of the doctrine of our Lord’s true and abiding Humanity. That doctrine being duly guarded, (as no doubt it is by the Fathers’ language thoroughly considered,) Hooker evidently would have felt himself free to receive that language in its literal meaning, as acknowledging a Presence most real and substantial, but not corporeal or natural;—not such as would be recognized by the bodily sense, though the veil were ever so much taken away. The very passage which Hooker, in stating his difficulty, alleges from S. Augustine, may seem to suggest the solution of it: “The Man Christ Jesus is now in that very place from whence He shall come in the same form and substance of flesh which He carried thither, and from which He hath not taken nature, but given thereunto immortality. According to this form He spreadeth not out Himself into all places.” Not in His human form, nor simply in all places; yet this hinders not, but that His Person may be wherever in His sacramental word He declares, “This is My Body,” by a Presence of His glorified Humanity, literally true, though to us undefinable.

<sup>†</sup> The italics are Hooker’s own, in his first edition.

<sup>u</sup> Eccl. Pol., lv. G.

§ 45. But if Hooker ought not really to be set down as a denier of commemorative sacrifice in the Eucharist, much less can our twenty-first Article be so interpreted with any shadow of reason. That Article obviously deals with those sacrifices only for which atoning virtue is claimed, and power to make satisfaction for sin, besides and apart from the offering of Christ on the cross. It does not touch the Eucharistic Sacrifice, considered as one with that presentation of His crucified and risen Body to the Father, which the Apostle to the Hebrews describes as taking place continually in heaven, for the application of the great remedy to the cleansing of each man's soul and conscience in particular. As in the typical atonement made yearly for God's ancient people, it was no disparagement to the virtue of the sin-offering, that its blood had to be brought by the high-priest within the veil, and applied by sprinkling to the holy places, the priests, and the people. To say that the sacrificial view of the Eucharist interferes with the sufficiency of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, would in effect be saying that Melchisedec could not be a priest because Aaron was; nay, more,—that our Lord could not be our Intercessor in heaven, because He had become our Redeemer here by His death.

Now, if the holy Eucharist as a sacrifice be all one with the memorial made by our High-Priest Himself in the very sanctuary of heaven, where He is both Priest, after the order of Melchisedec, and Offering, by the perpetual presentation of His Body and Blood; then, as the blessed inhabitants of heaven cannot but be thought of as adoring Him in both His aspects, of Priest and Sacrifice,—so how should His holy Church throughout all the world not adore Him in like manner, as often as she “goeth up to the reverend Communion” to offer up spiritual sacrifices, and “to be satisfied with spiritual meats<sup>x</sup>?” For there He is in His holy and perfect Manhood, *virtually* present, as our Priest, with him that ministereth, being one of those to whom He said, “Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;” and

<sup>x</sup> Hom. of the Sacrament, 1st part.

really present, as our Sacrifice, according to that other word, CHAP. II.  
 "This is My Body, and this is My Blood:" "Do this in remembrance of Me."

§ 46. And so the Catechism of the Church of England takes it; requiring for the validity of the outward sign, that it be not only "bread and wine," but *that* "Bread and Wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received;" i. e. over which Christ Himself hath spoken the words of institution. If any one doubt this construction, he may consider, first, that it would be mere tautology, little to be expected in such a document, to repeat here what had been plainly and sufficiently set down in the general definition of a sacrament—that it must be "ordained by Christ Himself;" next, that our view is no more than is required to make the description of this Sacrament equivalent to that which had been given of the other. For, (this section of the Catechism being plainly intended to be framed in exact logical order,) since in the account of holy Baptism, the outward and visible sign or form had been defined both by the Element and the Word; — the element, water; the word, "In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"—it was to be expected that there would be a like specification in the case of the holy Eucharist also. But nothing of the sort appears, unless we accept the above-mentioned account of the clause, "which the Lord hath commanded to be received." The outward part of the great Sacrament is on that hypothesis defined by its Element only, and no Word at all assigned to it. Whereas on our construction the well-known saying of S. Augustine is precisely kept in view: "*Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum.*"

Again, this mode of interpretation critically accords with a certain important distinction observed all along by the Church in dealing with these two blessed mysteries. The Word or verbal part of the form in Baptism is minutely and unchangeably laid down, but nothing is said or implied of any special qualification in the person speaking it. In the Eucharist, not only are the words of institution (as we take it) peremptorily enacted, but it is also enacted that they must be spoken by Christ Himself, saying in each case over

CHAP. II. the particular element, "Take, eat, this is My Body which is given for you;" and "Drink ye all of this, for this is My Blood." Thus the Catechism assumes that it is no true Supper of the Lord, unless the person celebrating be one expressly authorized to speak the words in our Lord's own Name; as much so as those were with whom He celebrated His first Eucharist. This, I say, harmonizes well with the fact notorious in all Church history, that all Christians, when charity requires, are empowered to administer holy Baptism, but none may "make the Body of Christ," except those specially commissioned by the Apostles.

Would it be going too far to say that our Church in this sentence simply accepts the idea of one only Consecrator, analogous to that so plainly preached by S. John Baptist, and expounded by S. Augustine, of one only Baptizer? Whereupon it would seem to follow, that in reality there is but one Eucharist; that our celebrations, how innumerable soever, and however widely separated in time and place, are not so many *commemorations* of that first offering in the upper room, but an actual *continuation* of it; a continuation of it on earth, the very image (as S. Paul and S. Ambrose speak) of that other and heavenly continuation of it, which began on our Lord's Ascension, and will go on to the end of the world.

This is the theory of the Church's daily Sacrifice. It would be literally continual, if all lands were Christian, and if Holy Communion were solemnized at the same hour in every Christian land. Not as if, according to the language of Roman writers, the expiatory Sacrifice on the Cross were repeated or continued on our altars. The Epistle to the Hebrews, and the ancient Church commenting on it, as expressly negative any such statement, as they affirm the continuance of the pleading commemorative Sacrifice: "The continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby."

The Man Christ Jesus, according to the Catechism, is thus *virtually* present, as the true Consecrator, in our Eucharist. Still more distinctly are we there instructed concerning the *real* Presence of His Body and Blood in that Sacrament,—to

be first our Oblation, and then our spiritual Food. Combining the several statements, they amount to this: the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in that it is a sacrament, has always in it two parts, whereof the inward and spiritual part is the Body and Blood of Christ;—and it has two purposes: 1. to be a continual remembrance, or memory, or memorial, before God as well as man, not a repetition or continuance, of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ; 2. to be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls, as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by bread and wine. I cannot understand these statements to imply less than a real and substantial Presence of Christ by the Presence of His Body and Blood; nor can I imagine any one believing Him so present, and not acknowledging the same by special adoration.

The rather, since, (if I may revert here to one of the principles laid down in the beginning of this essay,) His Presence here is associated not only with infinite blessings, but also with unspeakable condescension. He comes down in a manner to offer Himself anew for each one of us in particular, receiving Him worthily; and that under the poor and ordinary veil, or form, which we all know, thereby subjecting Himself (I speak as a man) to many indignities. He comes to be feasted on, not sacrificed only; as a Peace-offering to apply His own merits, not as a proper Sin-offering, as when on the Cross He merited all for us; and therefore He yields His Body and Blood, i. e. Himself, to be partaken of by us sinners. As partakers of the altar, we are permitted to eat of the sacrifice; which sacrifice in this case is that Man who is the Most High God. That, therefore, of which we eat, the same we are most humbly to worship; not the less, but the more, because in so giving Himself to us He is stooping so very low for our sakes. The very rule of giving thanks before meals, if we rightly consider it, changes itself into a law of adoration when it is applied to this Meal. If “every creature of God is good, and to be received with thanksgiving,” how much more that Flesh and Blood which the Son has taken into His own Divine Person, and by which

CHAP. II. He gives Himself to us. If we really believe that that which He declares to be His own Flesh and Blood is Jesus Christ giving Himself to us under the form of Bread and Wine, how can we help thanking, and therefore adoring, (for to thank God is to adore,) the unspeakable Gift, as well as the most bountiful Giver? seeing that in this case both are one. We may reverently apply here the apostolic words, "For if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?"

§ 47. Once more. It is the unquestionable doctrine both of the Old and New Testament, that, without prejudice to the special official priesthood of the sons of Aaron in the one dispensation, and the successors of the Apostles in the other, all the people of God, with the true Melchisedec at their head, are "a kingdom of priests, a royal priesthood," and every one is a "king and priest unto the Father, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." None may doubt that the chief of those spiritual sacrifices is that which causes all the rest to be acceptable,—Christ Himself offered up to the Father by the offering of His Body and Blood in Holy Communion. Accordingly, the Christian people have been instructed from the beginning to take their part in that offering, by the solemn Amen especially, where-with they have always responded to the Prayer of Consecration. There is hardly any point of our ritual which can be traced more certainly than this to the very apostolic times. Every one will remember S. Paul's saying, "When thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?"—words which, in a singular way, bear witness both to the share (τόπος) which all Christians have in the priesthood of Melchisedec, and to the distinction which nevertheless exists between those who might bless, and laymen (ἰδιῶται), who were not permitted to do so. S. Chrysostom's comment on the verse is, "If thou bless in the foreigners' tongue, the ordinary Christian, not knowing what thou sayest, and unable to interpret it, cannot respond the Amen, not hearing 'For

<sup>v</sup> 1 Cor. x. 30.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

ever and ever,' which is the end<sup>a</sup>." Justin Martyr mentions the Amen uttered by the people at the end of the consecration as a special circumstance of the Christian Eucharist: "To the Chief of the Brethren is brought Bread, and a cup of Water and Wine; which he taking, sends up (*ἀναπέμπτει*) praise and glory to the Father of all, by the Name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at large for these His favours vouchsafed unto us. And when he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present, by way of auspicious acclamation, say 'Amen'<sup>b</sup>." "And when the Chief Minister has offered the thanksgiving, and all the people have uttered their acclamation, those who are called among us Deacons make the distribution," &c. Here he seems to mark our common Priesthood by saying that the Celebrator "transmits" the prayers and thank-offerings to the Father; and his repeating the mention of the Amen indicates the importance of it.

"What a thing it is," exclaims again Tertullian<sup>c</sup>, "to pass from the Church of God unto the Church of the Devil! . . . to weary with applauding an actor those hands which thou hast just been lifting up unto the Lord! out of the mouth whereby thou hast uttered Amen to the Most Holy Thing, to bear testimony to a gladiator! to say 'For ever and ever'" (which was another of the Eucharistical acclamations) "to any but our Lord Christ!" And Tertullian, we may notice, was the author of the famous saying, "Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus?"

How sad to think that so many of those who are called to so high dignity should forfeit or reject it, either by unworthiness, or by refusing to own the mysterious Sacrifice which they are called to assist in offering! But those devout communicants who rightly regard themselves as exercising their share in the Church's Priesthood, will find in this yet another reason for adoring thankfulness to Him who has so lifted them from the dust, enabling them, with and under Him, by the hands of one especially commissioned to represent Him, to offer to the Father His own Body and Blood.

<sup>a</sup> On 1 Cor., Hom. 35, t. iii. 477, ed. Savile.

<sup>b</sup> Apol. § 64.

<sup>c</sup> De Spectaculis, 25.

§ 48. But now, to confirm out of Holy Scripture the sacrificial meaning of the words of institution, let us turn first to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which may perhaps not inaptly be considered, from beginning to end, as one grand theological harmony, its theme being the pregnant saying, That "the Law hath a *shadow* of good things to come, but not the very *image* of the things<sup>d</sup>." What is the difference between a shadow and an image? Not simply that, both being representations, the one is solid and stationary, the other unsubstantial and fugitive, but this also, which, if I mistake not, is all-important in our present argument;—that the word "shadow" may be used of any thing, which by ever so remote an analogy or faint resemblance calls a given object to the mind; whereas "image" implies a real similitude, an actual copy more or less exact, of something definitely known to the memory, or bodied forth by the imagination.

And "the *very* image" (αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν) adds the idea of perfection as an image,—instructs us that in this case we are to regard it as *the* authorized and authentic copy, the most perfect likeness of the thing represented which the material employed could admit of. The phrase seems to answer very nearly to the well-known philosophical form instanced in αὐτοάνθρωπος, αὐτοσοφία, and the like; as if one should say, αὐτοεἰκὼν—as complete an image as in the nature of things, and according to the mind of Him who framed them what they are, could possibly exist.

The word χαρακτήρ (= "express image," or "stamp,") in Heb. i. 3, seems to convey the same idea, in reference to the mystery of the revelation of the Father through the Son; as we read, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him;" the Son, to speak with the Athanasian divines, being the ἀπαρλλακτὸς εἰκὼν, the unswerving, undeviating, unmodified Image, of the Eternal Father.

Applying this exposition to S. Paul's phrase, we come to some such result as the following:—that the visible part of the Gospel system, or at least some portion of it which the Apostle was particularly speaking of, is not simply the shadow,

<sup>d</sup> Heb. x. 1.

but the reflection, as perfect as can be, of certain invisible things now existing in the heavenly places, of which the corresponding part of the law was but an "example," *ὑποδείγμα*, an indication by way of pattern or sample, and in comparison a most imperfect "shadow." In the Gospel you see the object itself, as in a mirror ; the Law could at most present but a rough outline or sketch of it. And the Image in the Gospel is of things even now in being, only far above out of our sight ; whereas the Law was altogether prophetic, foreshadowing *τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθὰ*, a state and system which as yet had no existence.

This comparison the Apostle proceeds to apply to the yearly sacrifices of the Law, especially those which took place on the day of atonement. He demonstrates their shadowy and imperfect nature, by the witness, first of the Law which enacts them, decreeing their annual repetition<sup>e</sup> ; then of the fortieth Psalm, predicting their abolition when He should come who should do God's will<sup>f</sup> ; and lastly, of the prophet Jeremiah, announcing that entire remission which would be inconsistent with the "remembrance of sins made again every year<sup>g</sup>." And so he passes on to describe "the very Image" which has taken place of these shadows, in words which answer to nothing surely on earth but the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. We have<sup>h</sup> "boldness to enter into the holiest by the Blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh ; and" we have "an High-priest over the house of God." Here is *ἐγκαταίσιμος*, an opening by solemn dedication of a new way into the holiest, and that by our Lord Himself, in virtue of His Blood, and by means of His Body, broken and rent, as even the veil which represented it ; and this in His office as Priest, over God's temple. And then comes a distinct account of the preparation, i. e. Baptism with repentance, faith, and charity. For, 1. the "heart" must be "sprinkled from an evil conscience, and the body washed with pure water ;" 2. "the profession of our faith" must be "held fast without wavering ;" and 3. we must "consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works."

<sup>e</sup> Heb. x. 2—4.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. 5—10.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. 15—18.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 19—25.

## CHAP. II.

What is this but the priesthood of the true Melchisedec exercised on earth, as in other parts of the Epistle the exercise of it in heaven is described; either simply (as in the places noted below <sup>i</sup>), or as identical with one function of the Aaronical priesthood, the entrance of the high-priest into the holy of holies? (as in chap. ix. and xiii. 10—16). If the Bread and Wine is not mentioned in words, it is sufficiently implied in these repeated references to Melchisedec; and the omission itself is significant, shewing it to be the will of the Holy Ghost that the worshipper should not allow his mind to dwell in the least upon what he *sees* in this Sacrament. It is strictly to be to him an Image, lifting him up to the great invisible realities even now going on both here and in heaven.

§ 49. This view of the Christian sacrifice was gathered from the Epistle to the Hebrews by some of the greatest and holiest Fathers of the Church, using the liturgical services to which they were accustomed as a commentary on that Epistle. Thus S. Ambrose, taking occasion from a verse in the Psalms <sup>k</sup>:

*"Surely every man walketh in an image. In what image, then, doth man walk? In that, of course, after the likeness whereof he was made; i. e., after the image of God. Now the image of God is Christ, who is the brightness of His glory, and the express Image of His Person."*

"Christ, therefore, the Image of God, came to the world, that we might no longer walk in a shadow, but in an image. For every follower of the Gospel walketh in Christ, the Image. . . . Therefore, as the people of the Jews went astray, because they walked in the shadow, so the Christian people go not astray, walking as they do in the Image, and having the Sun of Righteousness shining out upon them. O good Image, not coloured with the implements of the painter's art, however brilliant, but wrought out in the fulness of the Godhead!"

"<sup>l</sup> First, then, the Shadow led the way, the Image hath come after, the Truth has yet to be. The shadow in the Law, but the image in the Gospel, the truth in the heavenly places. The Shadow of the Gospel and of the congregation

<sup>i</sup> Heb. iv. 14—v. 10; vii. 1—3, 12—28; viii. 1—7.

<sup>k</sup> On Ps. 38, [39,] v., 6. § 24. <sup>l</sup> § 25.

of the Church in the Law; the Image of the truth to come in the Gospel; the Truth in the judgment of God. And so, what things are now celebrated in the Church, the shadow of them was in the discourses of the prophets. Their shadow in the deluge, and in the Red Sea, when our fathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. Their shadow, in that rock which gushed out in water, and followed the people. Was not that, in shadow, a sacrament of this holiest mystery? Was not the water from the rock in shadow as it were blood from Christ, in that it followed the people who were hastening away from it, that they might drink and not thirst; be redeemed, and not perish?

“But now the shade of night and of Jewish darkness hath departed, the day of the Church hath drawn nigh. Now we behold our good things by an image, and we possess the good things of the Image. We have seen the Chief of Priests coming unto us—we have seen and heard Him offering for us His own Blood: we priests follow as we may, to offer sacrifice for the people, though weak in deserts, yet honourable in sacrifice. Because, although now Christ is not seen to offer, nevertheless He is Himself offered on earth when Christ’s Body is offered; or rather, He is Himself manifested as offering in us, it being His own word which sanctifieth the sacrifice which is offered. And while in His own Person He stands by us, our Advocate with the Father, we nevertheless see Him not now: then we shall see Him, when the image shall have passed, and the truth come. Then no longer through a glass, but face to face, shall be seen the things that are perfect.

“<sup>1</sup> Go up, then, O man, into heaven, and thou shalt behold the things whereof in this world there was the shadow, or the image. Thou shalt behold not in part, not in a dark parable, but in fulfilment; not under a veil, but in the light. Thou shalt behold the true Light, the eternal and perpetual Priest, of whom thou didst here behold the images,—Peter, Paul, John, James, Matthew, Thomas. Thou shalt see the Perfect Man not now in image, but in truth; for ‘*as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.*’”

<sup>1</sup> § 26.

## CHAP. II.

More briefly again, in the book on the Duties of Christian Ministers<sup>m</sup>: "Those things then we ought to seek, wherein is perfection, wherein is truth. Here is the Shadow, here the Image, there the Truth. The shadow in the law, the image in the Gospel, the truth in the heavenly places. Beforetime a lamb was the offering, or a bullock, now Christ is offered; offered, that is, as Man, as capable of suffering: and as Priest He offers Himself, that He may forgive our sins; here in image, there in truth, where with the Father He intercedes for us as an Advocate.

"Here then we walk in an image, in an image we behold; there face to face, where full perfection is; because all perfection is in Truth."

S. Chrysostom, expounding the Epistle to the Hebrews, assumes all along the substantial identity of the Eucharistical office with Christ's continual sacrifice in heaven.

"'The priests of old,' saith the Apostle, 'serve to the example and shadow of heavenly things.' What things speaks he here of as heavenly? the things spiritual. For what if they are celebrated on earth? they are nevertheless worthy of heaven. For when our Lord Jesus lies immolated, when the Spirit draweth nigh, when He is here who sitteth on the right hand of the Father, when by the Laver men become His children, when they are denizens of the heavenly places, when we have there our country, our city, and conversation, when we are strangers to things here,—how can all that is here fail to become heavenly? Yea, let me ask, are not our hymns heavenly? the very strains which the Divine choirs of the incorporeal powers chant on high, do not we also, here below, utter notes in harmony with them? Is not our Altar, too, heavenly? Do you ask how? It hath nought of flesh; the things presented there become altogether spiritual. Not into ashes, not into smoke, not into sacrificial steam is that Sacrifice dissolved, but it renders the gifts set out there bright and glad to look upon. And how are the offices less than heavenly, seeing that unto the persons ministering unto them are still spoken, from the time that they were first uttered, the words, 'Whose sins ye retain, they are re-

<sup>m</sup> Lib. i. n. 248.

tained; whose ye forgive, they are forgiven?' How is it not all heavenly, when these have the very keys of heaven?" CHAP. II.

A few lines on he writes: "*See thou do all things according to the pattern which was shewed thee in the Mount.* Did he see then as concerning the construction of the Temple only, or concerning the sacrifices and all the rest? Nay, you will not be wrong in affirming this latter as well. *For the Church is heavenly, yea, it is nothing else than a heaven<sup>n</sup>.*"

Again, comparing the sprinkling of blood, by which the Mosaic covenant was inaugurated, with our Lord's Blood in the holy Eucharist, he writes<sup>o</sup>: "Our purification was not bodily, but spiritual, and the Blood spiritual. How? Because it flowed not from any body of an irrational animal, but from a Body formed by the Spirit. With this Blood, not Moses, but Christ sprinkled us, by the word which He spake: 'This is the Blood of the New Testament for the remission of sins.' This word, instead of hyssop, being dipped in the Blood, sprinkles all. And whereas in that instance the body was cleansed from without, (the 'purification being bodily,) here, because the cleansing is spiritual, it enters into the soul, and cleanses it; not being simply sprinkled over us, but springing as a fountain in our souls. The initiated know what I mean.

"Again, in the former instance, he used to sprinkle the surface alone; and the person sprinkled would wash himself again; for he did not, of course, go about always stained with blood: but in the soul it is not so; rather the Blood mingles itself with our very being, making it strong and chaste, and training it on to the Unapproachable Beauty itself."

On chap. x. 3 he writes<sup>p</sup>: "God ordained (saith the Apostle) continual offerings, by reason of weakness; and 'a remembrance of sins,' to take place. What then? do not we offer daily? Yes, we offer, but it is by way of memorial of His death. And this memorial is one, and not many. How is it one, and not many? Because it was once for all offered, as that one which was brought into the Holy of Holies. . . .

<sup>n</sup> Hom. xiv. on Hebrews viii. 5, t. iv.  
507, ed. Sav.

<sup>o</sup> Hom. xvi. on Heb. ix. 22, p. 518.

<sup>p</sup> Hom. xvii. p. 523.

CHAP. II. For it is the same [Person] whom we offer always; not now one [sheep], and to-morrow another, but always the same. And so the Sacrifice is One. . . . Christ is One everywhere, being in His fulness both in this place and in that One Body. As, therefore, though offered in many places, He is but One Body, and not many bodies, so also but One Sacrifice. Our High-Priest is He who offered the sacrifice which cleanseth us. That same we now also offer, that which was then offered, the Inexhaustible. This is done for a memorial of that which was then done. For, *Do this, He saith, in remembrance of Me.* We offer not another sacrifice, as the High-Priest then, but the same always. Or rather, we celebrate a memorial of a Sacrifice." Thus far of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

§ 49. And there is another book of Holy Scripture, which seems from beginning to end as if the Holy Spirit had indited it partly for this very purpose, that it might impress on Christ's people the greatness of Christ's continual sacrifice, whether on earth in Holy Communion, or in heaven by His appearing as our Advocate. It begins by thanking Christ for having made us kings and priests to His Father<sup>a</sup>. It introduces Him in the first vision as the Son of Man clad in priestly apparel, the long robe and the girdle; and walking in the midst of golden candlesticks, the well-known furniture of the Temple<sup>r</sup>. It relates to the fulness of the New Testament, such as it was completed at Pentecost; for it is the revelation given to our Lord, as to the Prophet like unto Moses, of things which were "shortly to come to pass;" it describes Him once and again as, "Him that liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore<sup>s</sup>;" the Priesthood which it delineates is that which He exercises in glory, not that which wrought out its work upon the Cross. He is here the anti-type of Melchisedec, not of Aaron; or rather of Aaron within the veil, not in the outer Tabernacle. His descriptions of Himself in the letters to the seven Churches, His promises and threatenings, are frequently associated with that most holy place: as where He says, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna<sup>t</sup>," with a

<sup>a</sup> Rev. i. 6.<sup>r</sup> Ibid. 12, 13.<sup>s</sup> Ibid. i. 18; ii. 8.<sup>t</sup> Ibid. ii. 17.

probable allusion to the manna laid up by the ark; where He engages to give a "new name," such as "Holiness to the Lord;" or to clothe His faithful ones in white apparel; where He speaks of having "the key of David," of setting "an open door" before us; of making him that conquereth "a pillar in the Temple of God"; and finally, not as Priest, but as King, of granting to such an one to sit on His throne, as He on His Father's throne.

The second vision, seen through a door opened in heaven<sup>x</sup>, and signifying also at its commencement that it related to things which should follow on that opening,—i. e. on the rending of the veil, which is His Flesh,—has its sphere entirely in a place of Divine worship, call it Temple, Tabernacle, or Church, the very sanctuary of the Holy of Holies itself. There appears the mercy-seat, a throne in heaven, and He that sitteth upon it; and around it the inferior thrones of God's people, twenty-four in number—twelve prophets and twelve apostles—as kings, sitting with crowns of gold on their heads; as priests, clothed in white raiment; lamps and a glassy sea before the throne, and cherubims within and around it. And it is all perpetual worship and thanksgiving; the Evangelists represented by the cherubim sounding the key-note, and the twenty-four taking it up with the most solemn act of worship<sup>y</sup>. Still the High-Priest does not appear, for the mystery as yet is only of Creation; but now, as a sealed book, comes that of Redemption, and One only in heaven and earth is found worthy to open it and loose its seals. Christ, our High-Priest and Sacrifice, is "the end of the Law for righteousness;" and how is He symbolized? not now as the Priest, but as the Victim; a "Lamb, as it had been slain<sup>z</sup>," but which now had ascended up on high to receive gifts for men, i. e. the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, both of power and of wisdom; "the seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth<sup>a</sup>." Observe where He stands; "in the midst," or central point, before the throne or mercy-seat,—the regular station of the sacrificing Priest before the altar. For as a

<sup>x</sup> Rev. iii. 5, 7, 8, 12, 21.<sup>x</sup> Ibid. iv. 1.<sup>y</sup> Ibid. 9—11.<sup>z</sup> Ibid. v. 6.<sup>a</sup> Ibid. i. 4.

CHAP. II. King, our awful Melchisedec "sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;" but as a Priest for ever He "standeth on the Mount Sion," in the height of the heavenly Jerusalem, "with His hundred forty and four thousand redeemed from the earth," presenting them by His own merits "without fault before the throne of God;" He standeth as slain: and (mark it well) as slain He is adored. For this is the order of the service. He cometh and taketh the Book of Prophecy (received by Him for men, as all other gifts, of His Father on His Ascension) out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne. The mention of the right hand is most commonly a token that mercy, as well as power, is being exercised. The receiving, then, of this gift of prophecy by the Mediator as a divine gift to the Church, is the signal for the whole Church to adore specially Him who so receiveth it for them. "The four beasts and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb." Surely, when the same Divine Being, the Lamb slain, receives for us and gives us His own Flesh and Blood, His own Self, His own Person, to be our very meat and drink, to nourish us to eternal life, less than adoring thankfulness is impossible.

The ritual (so to call it) proceeds with circumstances which keep up in a remarkable way the notion that the whole is probably an antitype of the Temple services, all but those which were strictly penitential or atoning. There is the sacrifice of praise, the thank-offering, for they have each his harp; and of prayer, the peace-offering, for there are the "golden bowls (vials) full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints<sup>b</sup>;" and there is, not the anticipation, but the memory of Christ's death; for the new song which they sing in answer to the call of the true David is, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: *for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth<sup>c</sup>.*" And to correspond with the whole burnt-offering, there is the concluding act of adoration and homage in which the

<sup>b</sup> Rev. v. 8.<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 9, 10.

Angels and all creatures join. All these are portions of the Liturgy according to the use of every Church from the beginning: in our own Communion Office they are strongly marked; every one familiar with it will be able at once to point out in it the Thanksgiving ("Lift up your hearts," &c.), the Intercession (in the Prayer for the Church Militant), the memory of Christ's death, and the Angels taking part in our services.

Only the penitential and strictly sacramental passages find no counterpart in the heavenly office, being in their very nature remedial, and belonging to this imperfect world. But there is no such reason for us to forego adoration; indeed, if we do, we seem to be turning ourselves out of the blessed company which S. John is describing. For as he heard every creature in earth, and under the earth, as well as in heaven, giving glory in its own way to Him that sat on the throne, in words which all the ancient Liturgies used at the end of their consecration prayer; and the four Evangelists answering Amen, (for they represent the verbal worship of the Church): so he saw both them and the twenty-four elders (namely, the whole body of Christians) begin their service with the act of falling down and worshipping the Lamb, and end it with the same homage to Him that sitteth upon the throne, i. e., as it may seem, to God the Father Almighty. Refusing to adore with the one would seem much the same kind of thing as refusing to say Amen with the other; a thought which surely no Christian can bear.

As the vision goes on, it becomes more and more evident that we are in a place of sacrifice—the true Tabernacle or Temple. The events associated with each seal are localized in this way: the four first are marked by voices from the four Cherubims respectively; the fifth and seventh by the mention of the golden altar before the throne, on which incense is offered with the prayers of all saints by an Angel, from a golden censer, and under which are seen the souls of the martyrs. It has four horns, and from it, as from the central spot in the holy place, having a measure of its own apart from the rest<sup>d</sup>, the voices of prayer go forth; in answer to

<sup>d</sup> Rev. xi. 1.

CHAP. II. which come the great turns in God's providence appointed for the due ordering of the Church and the world; and from which conversely come the voices of holy resignation and thanksgiving, acknowledging how true and just are His judgments. Under the sixth seal, the true Israelites having been sealed, the countless multitudes from all lands renew their solemn service to God and the Lamb, this time standing, and not falling prostrate, with palms in their hands, as on the Feast of Tabernacles, and in white robes, like the priests in the Temple; and their blessedness is to be before the throne of God.

Further on, when a great crisis and agony is at hand, the Temple and Altar are to be measured by way of preparing for it<sup>d</sup>. And in contemplation of a great deliverance, the twenty-four elders enthroned before God fall on their faces and worship Him with thanksgiving: "And the four-and-twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God<sup>e</sup>." When, on the other hand, fearful judgments are coming, the temple of God in heaven is opened, and the ark of the covenant is seen<sup>f</sup>. The hundred and forty and four thousand who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,—i. e., as it should seem, in counsels of perfection,—they also appear before the throne, the four beasts, and the elders, with a song of their own, which ordinary Christians cannot learn.

From the Temple in heaven goes forth the Angel who is to intercede with the Judge of all the earth, to reap His final harvest, the fields being ready; and likewise two other Angels, avengers; one of them bearing a sharp sickle, the other having power over the fire; and the latter calls on the former to proceed with his vintage, the grapes of the earth being ripe: in which we may observe how our Lord delighteth in mercy, for the harvest of them that are saved He reaps Himself, but the wrathful vintage He delegates to His ministers.

The sea of glass mingled with fire<sup>g</sup>—thought to symbolize Baptism with water and the Holy Ghost, on which, as on a sure foundation, those Christians stand who are yet fighting victoriously—this also recalls to memory the molten sea, which

<sup>d</sup> Rev. xi. 1.<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 16.<sup>f</sup> Ibid. 19; xv. 5.<sup>g</sup> Ibid. 2.

Solomon placed at the entrance of the Temple. And the use CHAP. II.  
of the present tense, "conquering," not as in our English, "having gotten the victory;" and their singing, not the "new song," but the song of Moses as well as of the Lamb,—these are pregnant signs of their belonging to the Church Militant, although they are admitted to share in the worship before the throne.

The Angels with the vials or howls of God's wrath come out of the Temple in priests' apparel, because it is the Church's prayer, "Avenge me of mine adversary," which prevails with God to interfere; and therefore one of the Cherubims or Evangelists, on the part of the Church, supplies them with the stores of "deadly wine" which they are are to pour out. In the course of the ensuing plagues there is a voice of grave exultation from the earth, from the Angel of the waters, "Thou art righteous, O Lord," which finds an echo (so to speak) from another Angel out of the altar in heaven: "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments<sup>b</sup>." At the pouring out of the last vial there comes "a great voice out of the Temple of heaven, from the throne itself, "it is done." One such word besides, and one only, is spoken in the New Testament, "It is finished:" when He gave up the Ghost. The approaching end of the Passion (so to call it) of Christ's Mystical Body, is announced by the same Divine cry from the throne, as that of His natural Body had been from the Cross.

In the following vision of great Babylon<sup>i</sup>, the scene of the prophetic survey is changed for a time; the mystery of iniquity, with its workings, is to be described in detail, and we are taken into the midst of it, and are made to see how craftily it is ordered so as to correspond with the mystery of godliness: Babylon being set against Jerusalem; the beast from the abyss against the Lamb; the purple and scarlet against the white apparel; the names of blasphemy against the new Name; her foul adulteries against the marriage of the Lamb; the wine of the wrath of her fornication against the river of the water of life; the brand of spiritual slavery in the forehead and right hand, against the holy

<sup>b</sup> Rev. xvi. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. xvii., xviii.

CHAP. II. and saving sign of the Cross; and most especially the worship of the dragon, and of the beast, his vicegerent, against the worship of God and the Lamb. That is the main point, the one *worship* contradicting the other. Mark, then, with what significance we are invited as it were to return from this fearful survey of Christendom, become heathen again, (the beast's deadly wound healed,) and the judgments impending on it, to the glorious uninterrupted ceremonial of the Temple in heaven, such as it had gone on night and day, from the hour of the High-Priest's ascension<sup>k</sup>; the four Cherubim and the twenty-four elders falling down as before and worshipping Him that liveth for ever and ever; the Mediator giving the signal for praise, and the answer made with Amen and Alleluia. Only as the times on earth grow worse, the joyful commemoration, the marriage of the Lamb, is more and more distinctly announced, and the warning against any worship but that of God, how suitable soever it may appear even to a religious instinct, more and more plainly enforced<sup>l</sup>.

The final vision of the Apocalypse appears to me (desiring to speak with all reverent doubtfulness) to begin with the beginning of chapter xx., and to recapitulate the history of the whole dispensation briefly, but more at large in the very termination of it. The thousand years on this hypothesis will denote the whole duration of the Church on earth, during which Satan is comparatively bound; except the little time of his loosing at the end, which will correspond with the want of faith which the Son of Man will find when He cometh. This being taken as a brief sketch of the working of Christianity on earth, the next section, ver. 4—6, would seem to tell something of what is going on during the same period in the heavenly Jerusalem; according to the manner of this Divine book. Observe, if it be so, how the vision goes on realizing the idea of a perpetual spiritual sacrifice, in which the souls of Christ's martyrs especially, but with them also the souls of all who have kept themselves unspotted from the world,—not worshipping the beast, nor enslaving themselves to him at all,—are living and reigning with Christ, as so many inferior Melchisedecs, priests at once and kings:—

<sup>k</sup> Rev. xix.<sup>l</sup> Ibid. 10.

kings, for they sit on thrones, and judgment is given them; CHAP. II.  
and it is twice written of them, they reigned, and they are  
to reign, with Christ a thousand years;—priests, for it is  
written again, “They shall be priests of God and of Christ.”  
If of Christ as well as of God, to be sure they adore Christ  
as well as God in the spiritual commemorative sacrifices  
wherein they are permitted to join with Him.

And if those sacrifices, as the ancient Church always be-  
lieved, are all one with our Eucharist on earth, then part of  
our ritual, one should think, would be to adore Him also.

And what is the conclusion, the perfect consummation and  
bliss, toward which these heavenly sacrifices are continually  
tending? It is a divine *feast*,—“the marriage supper of the  
Lamb,”—the river of the water of life, and the tree of life.  
You cannot read of it without thinking of what we spiritually  
receive in Holy Communion, any more than you can read of  
the services going before it without thinking of what we spiri-  
tually offer there. By eating of that which is sacrificed, we  
become “partakers with the altar<sup>m</sup>,” both of the altar of the  
Cross, and of the intercessory altar before the throne.

§ 50. Two more points occur in the Apocalypse, both of  
them suggestive, as it seems to me, of the substantial identity  
of the earthly and heavenly sacrifices. The one, that they are  
both in a certain sense to come to an end, at “the time of  
restitution of all things.” With regard to our earthly Eucha-  
rist the point is unquestionable; we are to “shew the Lord’s  
death *till He come*.” For as Theodoret says, “After His com-  
ing, there is no more need of the symbols of His Body, the  
Body itself being visible.” Or in more familiar and more  
beautiful language: “When that which is perfect is come,  
the use of sacraments shall cease; because the blessed in hea-  
venly glory need not any sacramental remedy.” This all will  
comprehend, so far as our sacrifices and sacraments have any-  
thing of this earth. But Holy Scripture seems to affirm  
the same in a certain way of that which we suppose Holy  
Communion to be an image of. Concerning our Lord’s  
kingly office, whereof Melchisedec is a type, although “of

<sup>m</sup> 1 Cor. x. 18.

<sup>n</sup> On 1 Cor. xi. 26, t. iii. 238.

° Thomas à Kempis, iv. 11.

CHAP. II. His kingdom there is no end," it is nevertheless plainly written, He shall in the end "deliver it up to God, even the Father." "The sceptre of that spiritual regiment over us in this present world is at the length to be yielded up into the hands of the Father which gave it; that is to say, the use and exercise thereof shall cease, there being no longer on earth any militant Church to govern<sup>p</sup>;" and the Son as Man shall be simply "subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all." In like manner, it would be no strange thing if His priestly office, whereby He fulfils the other half of Melchisedec's character, were declared to be so far at an end, as that the perpetual intercession and memorial Sacrifice for the application of His merits to sinners shall have ceased. And accordingly, in the heavenly Jerusalem, he whose visions had all along seemed to place Him in a temple, with its mercy-seat and altar of incense, and all its mysterious furniture, now writes, "I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it<sup>q</sup>." One is afraid to conjecture; but something of the same kind may possibly be intimated in the saying, "At that day ye shall ask in My name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved Me, and have believed that I came out from God<sup>r</sup>;"—in the invitation, "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord;"—in the promise, "He shall gird Himself and come forth and serve them;" coupled with the other promise, "His servants shall serve Him, and they shall see His face." If there be anything in these surmises, then the Eucharist and the Commemorative Sacrifice have this additional mark of identity, that they come to an end together.

§ 51. The other point worth noticing is the significant way in which "the wrath of the Lamb" is mentioned, corresponding, as it may seem, to the threatenings against unworthy receivers, and especially against such as Judas; in that they turn the Blood of the Sacrifice and Sacrificial Feast into "the wine of the wrath of God." That wine comes out of "the wine-press" which is "trodden without

<sup>p</sup> Hooker, v. 54.<sup>q</sup> Rev. xxi. 22.<sup>r</sup> S. John xvi. 26, 27.

the city<sup>s</sup>:" and by whom is it trodden? by the Son of Man alone; as both Isaiah and S. John declare<sup>t</sup>: whether it be for mercy or for judgment, the sins and sufferings of the whole world are gathered into one heap, and laid upon His head in Mount Calvary; there He suffered "without the gate;" there is that wine-press which He describes in the parable of the Vineyard, as a necessary part of the mystery of the kingdom of God. The contents of that wine-press, duly taken, are the wine which Wisdom, i. e. the Son of God, hath mingled as part of her Sacrificial Feast<sup>u</sup>; they are the "wines on the lees well refined," promised for the banquet which the Lord of Hosts was to make to all people in His mountain, the Church<sup>v</sup>; they are the water made wine, the best of the creation of God, provided for those called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. But unworthily and irreligiously partaken of, they are "the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation;" they are the wine-cup of the fierceness of God's wrath to be given to the great Babylon, God being *put in remembrance* of her<sup>w</sup>; they are "the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Sometimes it is Babylon herself who gives it them: "And there followed another Angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication<sup>x</sup>;" "With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication<sup>y</sup>;" "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abomination and filthiness of her fornication<sup>z</sup>." Sometimes, in the old prophets, God Himself gives it by the hand of Babylon: "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore the nations are mad<sup>a</sup>;" "For thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me; Take the wine-cup of this

<sup>s</sup> Rev. xiv. 20.<sup>t</sup> Isa. lxiii. 3; Rev. xix. 15.<sup>u</sup> Prov. ix. 5.<sup>v</sup> Isa. xxv. 6.<sup>w</sup> Ibid. 16—19.<sup>x</sup> Rev. xiv. 8.<sup>y</sup> Ibid. xvii. 2.<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 4.<sup>a</sup> Jer. li. 7.

CHAP. II. fury at My hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it<sup>b</sup>;" "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture; and He poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them<sup>c</sup>." In all instances it is the world, more or less, profanely aping the Church; the Sacraments of the Church turned into sacraments of the Devil: that special horror and sin of profaning Christ's Sacrifice, which is in kind the sin forbidden in the third commandment, is spoken of as committed in the greatest conceivable intensity.

The threatenings, therefore, of the Book of Revelations, as well as its rewards and promises, suppose a sacrificial feast, and the Victim worthily or unworthily received. They represent Blood as given to wicked Christians to drink, which Blood is the Blood of the Son of God crucified afresh by their sins; they are guilty of it, and they receive it to their damnation. This tends, so far, to confirm the idea that the heavenly ritual in the Apocalypse is, in fact, our Eucharistic ritual, and that the adoration there practised is a precedent for adoring in the Eucharist.

On the whole, we should, perhaps, be borne out in affirming, after consideration of what has been alleged both from natural piety and from probable interpretation of Scripture, that the presumption is very strong in favour of such adoration,—so strong, that unless there can be shewn an express precept to the contrary, a loving and thankful Christian would practise it of course; so strong, that such an one might with confidence apply to this case the first half of the divine canon, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God," without fear of inadvertently violating the latter, the negative portion of the same, "Him only shalt thou serve."

<sup>b</sup> Jer. xxv. 15.

<sup>c</sup> Ps. lxxv. 8.

## CHAPTER III.

WITNESS OF FATHERS, COUNCILS, LITURGIES, AND  
CHURCH TRADITION.

§ 1. But what says Christian antiquity? for it is here as CHAP. III.  
in respect to the Articles of the Faith, or the Canon of Holy  
Scripture itself. As we could not admit anything into the  
Catholic Creed merely upon its appearing to ourselves, ever  
so strongly, that it was taught as necessary to salvation in Holy  
Scripture; as we might not insert any book, chapter, or verse  
in our copies of God's Holy Word merely upon our own strong  
persuasion of its being so good and scriptural that it must  
have been inspired; so also in respect of the Holy Commu-  
nion, (as of other main points of evangelical worship,) our  
own Church instructs us that, "before all other things, this  
we must be sure of especially, that this Supper be in such  
wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did and  
commanded to be done, as His holy Apostles used it, and the  
good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it. For, (as  
that worthy man S. Ambrose saith,) 'He is unworthy of the  
Lord that otherwise doth celebrate that mystery, than it was  
delivered by Him; neither can he be devout that otherwise  
doth presume than it was given by the Author<sup>d</sup>.'"

If, then, we found a consent of Fathers and Liturgies in  
prohibiting the worship of Christ's Person, present in the  
Eucharist by the presence of His Body and Blood, we durst  
not practise it; our reasoning from Scripture and the coun-  
sel of our own heart must give way: and if we found the  
matter left open, though we might humbly and modestly use  
such worship ourselves, we could not positively judge that it  
was an error to omit it, much less could we denounce the  
prohibition of it as touching a vital portion of Christian doc-

<sup>d</sup> Homily I. of the Sacrament, &c., near the beginning.

CHAP. III. trine, i. e. the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in that Sacrament. But the case stands far otherwise: for, first, we have positive historical evidence sufficient to convince any fair mind that in the fourth century Christians did universally adore Christ so present,—such evidence as cannot be set aside without greatly damaging the witness of antiquity in regard both of the Creed and the Canon of Holy Scripture. Secondly, we have nothing at all to indicate that such worship was a recent innovation, or a partial and unnecessary development; but we have very much in the way of presumptive evidence implying its existence among Christians from the very beginning, although, for a reason to be explained, it is seldom, if ever, directly enjoined in the Liturgies.

§ 2. First, then, for the direct historical evidence. About the middle of the fourth century, S. Cyril, then presbyter, afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem, wrote his Catechetical Lectures; in the last of which, instructing the newly confirmed how to behave themselves in receiving Holy Communion, he says, "After having partaken of the Body of Christ, approach also to the cup of His Blood, not stretching forth thine hands, but bending, and saying, in the way of adoration and religious ceremonial<sup>c</sup>, *Amen*; be thou hallowed also by partaking of the Blood of Christ." The word rendered "religious ceremonial" appears especially to be limited to that kind of worship which acknowledges a peculiar presence of Deity. - That and Adoration, taken together, seem nearly equivalent to *λατρεία*, in its definite theological meaning. The posture is evidently not specified, any further than this—that it must be either kneeling, prostration, or standing with a reverent inclination of the body,—*venerabiliter curvi*, as a later authority expresses it.

The ground of this injunction, the Real Presence, had been repeatedly laid down by S. Cyril before, in words well known, of which I will cite a few out of many: "Regard not thou the Bread and Wine as merely such, for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to our Lord's declaration. And what if thy senses outwardly suggest the other? yet

<sup>c</sup> τρόπον προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος.

let faith confirm thee; judge not of the matter by thy taste, CHAP. III.  
 but by the faith do thou assure thyself, without any manner  
 of doubt, that He counteth thee worthy of the Body and  
 Blood of Christ<sup>a</sup>." And elsewhere: "Approaching, there-  
 fore, come not with thy wrists extended or thy fingers  
 open, but make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right,  
 which is on the eve of receiving the King. And having  
 hallowed thy palm, receive the Body of Christ, saying after  
 it Amen<sup>b</sup>."

The tradition, then, of the mother Church of Christendom  
 in the middle of the fourth century, was to receive with ado-  
 ration, just because it is the Body and Blood of Christ. There  
 are no subtleties, no explanations; the simple word of the  
 Lord is support, exposition, reason, and guidance sufficient.  
 And it does not come at all as a portion of S. Cyril's own  
 teaching, but as a rehearsal of the established custom of the  
 Church of Jerusalem. "Hold fast these *traditions* unspotted,  
 and keep yourselves free from offence. Sever not yourselves  
 from the Communion; deprive not yourselves, by the pollu-  
 tion of sins, of these holy, spiritual mysteries<sup>i</sup>." He speaks  
 as earnestly, and almost in the same words, as he had before  
 spoken of the Articles of the faith: "Behold therefore, bre-  
 thren, and hold the *traditions* which ye now receive, and  
 write them on the table of your hearts. This keep with  
 godly fear, lest haply any of you, being puffed up, be spoiled  
 by the enemy; lest some heretic pervert any of the things  
 delivered unto you. For faith is like casting down money  
 on the table; and this we have now done; but God requires  
 of you an account of the deposit: *I charge thee before God*,  
 saith the Apostle, *who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus*  
*Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession,*  
*that ye keep this faith delivered unto thee without spot, until*  
*the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.* The treasure of life  
 hath now been committed unto thee, and the Master will  
 seek His deposit at His appearing<sup>j</sup>." And it is observable  
 that in both instances he follows the phrasology of S. Paul<sup>k</sup>,  
 who in one place warns us to meet the approaching Antichrist

<sup>a</sup> xxii. 6.<sup>j</sup> v. 12, 13.<sup>b</sup> xxiii. 21.<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 2.<sup>i</sup> xxiii. 23.

CHAP. III. by standing and holding fast the *traditions* of the Creed; in another, praises the Corinthians for keeping in all points the "ordinances" (*mary.*, traditions) as he delivered them to them. And it is clear that the "traditions" he refers to relate to the public service in solemn assemblies, and most especially to the Holy Communion. The custom therefore of adoration on that occasion, was not simply enjoined in the Church of Jerusalem at that time, but it was enjoined as an old tradition, in the same words in which the Apostle had urged or recommended the rules which he himself had delivered. Is it too much to say that S. Cyril virtually represents it as being an apostolical tradition? At any rate, the mere fact of its having been then a part of the rubric in so venerable a Church, is a reason why it should not be hastily condemned as in itself wrong or superstitious.

§ 3. About 381, the year of the second Œcumenical Council, S. Ambrose, by desire of the Emperor Gratian, wrote his three books "Of the Holy Spirit," to prove and illustrate, against the Arians, the Godhead of that Divine Person. In book iii. c. 11, he is dealing with an objection alleged by them from S. John iv. 23, 24. Their argument was, if I rightly comprehend it, as follows: "In the saying, 'The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him: God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth,'—the words 'spirit and truth' signify *persons*, through whom and in whom the Father willeth to be worshipped." This they take for granted, and go on thus to reason upon it: "That person through whom and in whom another is worshipped is not to be worshipped himself. But the Father is worshipped through and in the Spirit; therefore the Spirit is not to be worshipped."

S. Ambrose<sup>1</sup> replies to this, *first*, what interpreters in general would say, that "spirit," as is very usual, means a spiritual grace,—the grace of loving devotion in the heart,—as "truth" means a deep conviction of the reality of the unapproachable Godhead. (So S. Ambrose here takes it; but,

according to the ordinary use of the word 'truth' in S. John's Gospel, it would rather seem to mean the substance of the kingdom of heaven, as opposed to the shadows of the world and of the Law.) CHAP. III.

But, secondly, granting that the words in question do really mean the Persons of the Spirit and of Christ, then "God is adored in the Truth, just as He is adored in the Spirit. Either, then, the two are alike inferior,—which God forbid thou shouldst believe,—and so not even the Son is adored; or (which is the truth) the unity of the one is just like that of the other; and then the Spirit also is to be adored<sup>m</sup>." "Therefore," he repeats, "if in this place they understand truth according to the usual sense, let them understand spirit to be spiritual grace, and there is no offence; or if they explain the Truth to be Christ, let them say that He must not be worshipped.—But then," he goes on, "they are refuted by the doings of religious men, by the whole course of the Scriptures. Thus Mary adored Christ, and is therefore ordained the first messenger of the resurrection to the Apostles, undoing the hereditary bond, and the grievous fault of woman-kind. For so the Lord wrought in a mystery; *that where sin had abounded, grace might much more abound.* And with reason is a woman commissioned unto men; that she who had been first to be a messenger of sin to the man, might be the first messenger of grace.

"The Apostles, too, adored; and even because they bore the witness of the faith, they retained the office of being masters in the faith. The Angels, too, adored,—of whom it was written, *And let all His angels adore Him.*

"And they adore not only His Godhead, but also His Footstool, as it is written, *And adore His Footstool, for it is holy.* Else, if they deny that in Christ the mysteries of Incarnation also are to be adored, wherein we discern (so to speak) express traces of Divinity, and the ways of the heavenly Word; let them read how the very Apostles adored Him rising in the glory of His flesh.

"Therefore, if it is no disparagement to Christ, that God is adored *in* Christ, because Christ too is adored; neither is it,

<sup>m</sup> § 72.

CHAP. III. of course, any disparagement to the Spirit, that God is adored in the Spirit. . . .

“ But let us consider how the prophet's saying, *Adore His footstool*, bears upon the mystery of our Lord's Incarnation. For we must not interpret the word ‘footstool’ by the custom of men, since God is neither corporeal nor finite, that we should imagine a stool placed for the support of His feet. Neither do we read of anything to be adored, save God; because it is written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*. How then should the prophet give a rule contrary to the Law, nurtured as he was in the Law, and instructed in the Law? The inquiry, then, is no ordinary one, and we must very accurately consider what ‘footstool’ means. For elsewhere we read, ‘Heaven is My throne, and earth is My footstool.’ Well, but neither may we adore the earth, because it is one of God's creatures.

“ But let us see; perhaps the prophet means that that earth is to be adored which the Lord Jesus took on Him in assuming flesh. And so by the footstool the earth is understood, and by the earth the flesh of Christ, *which, to this day, we adore in the Mysteries*, and which the Apostles, as we said above, did adore in the Lord Jesus. For Christ is not divided, but One; neither, when He is adored as the Son of God, is it denied that He was born of a Virgin. The Sacrament, then, of the Incarnation being adorable, and Incarnation the work of the Spirit, as it is written, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, and the Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God*,—doubtless the Holy Spirit also is to be adored, since He is adored who, as to His flesh, is born of the Holy Ghost.

“ And to prevent any one's extending this to the Virgin Mary, Mary was the temple of God, not the God of the temple. And therefore He only was to be adored who was performing His work in the temple.

“ You see that God's being adored in the Spirit is no ground of objection, since the Spirit also is adored.”

This long passage of S. Ambrose is here cited, not only on account of the express and inevitable testimony which he

bears to the custom of the Church in his time,—“The earth (which we are bidden to adore) means the flesh of Christ, *which to this day we adore in the Mysteries* ;” but also because that great theologian and confessor so clearly sets out the principle and reason of such worship, according to the analogy of the faith. The Body present in the Eucharist is to be adored on the same ground which made it right for S. Mary Magdalen and the Apostles to adore our risen Lord ; and it follows, from the unity of His Person, that to refuse it adoration is to act as if Christ were divided, and not One ; and He signifies incidentally, but not less clearly, that all things and all creatures which are merely adjuncts of His Person, not essential parts of His humanity, (as His Soul and Body both are,)—such things, how high and precious soever, are not to be adored ; no, not if they come inconceivably near to Himself. The two short sentences relating to the Virgin Mary bring out this caution very forcibly.

§ 4. Moreover S. Ambrose’s testimony is distinctly repeated by His spiritual son, S. Augustine. He, in his popular exposition of the 99th Psalm, delivered in Africa about thirty years later than what has been quoted from S. Ambrose,—i. e. about 411-15,—adopts S. Ambrose’s interpretation ; or rather appeals to it without all question as the interpretation of the Church.

“*Worship His footstool*”. See, brethren, what He com-mandeth us to worship. In another passage of the Scriptures it is said, *The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool*. Doth He then bid us worship the earth, since in another passage it is said that it is God’s footstool ? How then shall we worship the earth, when the Scripture saith openly, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God* ? Yet here it saith, *Fall down before His footstool* ; and explaining to us what His footstool is, it saith, *The earth is My footstool*. I am in doubt ; I fear to worship the earth, lest He who made the heaven and the earth condemn me ; again, I fear to refrain from worshipping the footstool of my Lord, because the Psalm bid-deth me *fall down before His footstool*. I ask, what is His footstool ? and the Scripture telleth me, *The earth is My footstool*.

CHAP. III. In hesitation I turn unto Christ, since I am herein seeking Himself; and I discover how the earth may be worshipped without impiety,—how His footstool may be worshipped without impiety. For He took upon Him earth from earth; because flesh is from earth, and He received flesh from the flesh of Mary. And because He walked here in very flesh, and gave that very flesh to us to eat for our salvation,—*and no one eateth that flesh unless he hath first worshipped*,—we have found out in what sense such a footstool of our Lord's may be worshipped; and not only that we sin not in worshipping it, but that we sin in not worshipping.

"But doth the flesh give life? Our Lord Himself, even when He was speaking in praise of this same Earth, said, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing*. Therefore when thou bowest thyself down prostrate before the 'earth,' look not as if unto earth, but unto that holy One whose footstool it is that thou dost worship; for thou dost worship it on His account: wherefore He hath added here also, *Fall down before His footstool*, for He is holy. Who is holy? He in whose honour thou dost worship His footstool. And when thou worshipping Him, see that thou do not in thy thought remain in the flesh, and fail to be quickened by the Spirit; for He saith, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing*. But when our Lord praised it, He was speaking of His own flesh, and He had said, *Except a man eat My Flesh, he shall have no life in him*. Some disciples of His, about seventy, were offended, and said, *This is an hard saying; who can hear it?* And they went back, and walked no more with Him. It seemed unto them hard that He said, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you*: they received it foolishly; they thought of it carnally, and imagined that the Lord would cut off parts from His Body, and give unto them; and they said, *This is a hard saying*. It was they who were hard, not the saying; for unless they had been hard, and not meek, they would have said unto themselves, He saith not this without reason, but there must be some latent mystery herein. They would have remained with Him, softened, not hard; and would have learnt that from Him, which they who remained, when the others de-

parted, learnt. For when twelve disciples had remained with Him, on the others' departure, they, as if in grief for the death of the former, pointed out to Him, how the other were offended by His words, and turned back. But He instructed them, and saith unto them, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life.* Understand spiritually what I have said: ye are not to eat this body which ye see; not to drink that blood which they who will crucify Me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery; spiritually understood, it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood. *O magnify the Lord our God, and fall down before His Footstool, for He is holy.*"

In this passage I would remark the same three things which were observable in S. Ambrose; the fact, the doctrinal aspect of it, and the caution against abuse. The fact, in His saying, "No man eateth that Flesh unless he hath first worshipped;" the doctrinal aspect of it, in that it is an acknowledgment, first of the Incarnation, and then of the Real Presence. "Of the flesh of Mary He took Flesh, and in that very Flesh walked here among us." Again: "that very Flesh He gave us to be eaten for our salvation." Thirdly, there is the caution against low and carnal understanding drawn from our Lord's saying, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." Though it is "*Ipsa Caro*" which we are commanded to adore, it is not "*Hoc Corpus quod videtis*;" the very Body, but not subject to the senses. I would observe, also, that neither of these great teachers in any degree *grounds* the practice of adoration upon the verse on which they are commenting, but taking the practice for a thing approved and granted, they allege it, both of them, as pointing out the true meaning of that verse; and S. Ambrose, in particular, as strengthening the proof that the Holy Spirit is to be worshipped; which proposition he was then maintaining against the Arians.

§ 5. It may be well to add a few words on the ancient rendering of the verse in question. As far as I have been able to find, the phrase here rendered *adore*, or "worship,"

CHAP. III. is in every place but three unquestionably followed by a noun denoting the *object* of worship. When the place or other adjunct is to be mentioned, the preposition used is לְ, or עַל, or the like—as Psalm v. 7; cxxxviii. 2; Is. lx. 14. The three places which might seem exceptional, as to the use of the particle לְ with the verb of worship, are Ps. cxxxii. 7; this of which we are speaking, xcix. 5; and the last verse of the same Psalm. The two former in the Hebrew are one: “Worship the footstool;” “we will worship” לְהִתְהַלֵּל, “His footstool.”

There remains the last verse of Ps. xcix., where the Hebrew verb and preposition are the same, only the noun following, instead of “His footstool,” is “His holy hill.” Now in 1 Chron. xxviii. 2, David speaks of building a house of rest “for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for *the footstool* of our God;” and in Lam. ii. 1, “He remembered not *His footstool* in the day of His anger.” Here we see the Temple, or the most holy part of it, represented as the Lord’s footstool, in allusion, no doubt, to the Cherubim appearing over the mercy-seat, and the Lord enthroned in His glory between them. But His Temple, He Himself tells us, is the type of His Body,—both of His natural Body, and of His mystical Body the Church; and concerning this latter He says in Isaiah lx. 13, “I will make the place of My feet,” i. e. My footstool, “glorious.”

Again, the holy mountain itself, as S. Augustine remarks on this verse, is a signal type of Christ, as well as of the Church:—“What is His mountain? we read elsewhere of this mountain, that it was ‘a stone cut out of a mountain without hands, which brake in pieces all the kingdoms of the earth, and grew, and became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.’ What is the mountain whence the stone was cut out without hands? The kingdom of the Jews in the first place, because they worshipped one God. Out of it was hewn a stone—our Lord Jesus Christ. What is ‘cut out without hands?’ born of the nation of the Jews, without agency of man. That stone grew, and in its growth brake to pieces all the kingdoms of the earth, and it hath become

a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This is the Catholic Church; and do ye rejoice that ye are in communion with it.” CHAP. III.

If, then, according to that identity of Christ and His Church which in some sense is continually affirmed in Holy Scripture, we suppose “His holy hill” in the last verse of Psalm xcix. to be equivalent to “His footstool” in ver. 5, the precepts in the two, spiritually taken, come to the same thing—a command to adore the Son of God in His holy humanity; and then most especially, when His Humanity is not only most signally manifested, but also mysteriously communicated to us; where the natural Body and mystical Body are made more entirely *one* than on any other occasion here on earth.

§ 6. It is obvious, however, that our appeal to these Fathers does in no degree involve the correctness either of the Septuagint and Vulgate rendering, “Adore His footstool,” or of the patristical interpretation of it. Neither the fact of universal adoration, nor the connection of it with the substance of the faith, depends at all for its evidence on that verse itself. The translation may be ever so incorrect, and the mystical meaning alleged ever so fanciful, and yet the passages will be available to demonstrate, beyond the shadow of doubt, that our Lord’s Body was then universally adored in the Eucharist. There is no getting rid of such sayings as “*Caro Christi, quam hodieque in mysteriis adoramus;*” “*Nemo illam carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit.*” If they are genuine—which no one disputes—they prove the fact: at least, as concerns the Church of Italy and Africa, i. e. the whole West. For we cannot conceive S. Ambrose or S. Augustine, the one in a public homily, the other in a controversial treatise written by an emperor’s desire against a great and influential party, affirming what any one might know by the witness of his own eyes to be false. If their evidence is not to be accepted here, neither need it in the matter of infant baptism, nor of the canon of Scripture, nor of any other of the many ecclesiastical usages which they mention, and of which every one of their Christian contemporaries must have been just as cognizant as

CHAP. III. themselves. In short, the matter is too plain to bear arguing upon.

Nor ought it to be unobserved that S. Ambrose in particular implies the practice of adoration to be not only general in his time, but to have come down from the beginning. He does not say "hodie," but "hodieque;" not "now-a-days," but "to this day." The word is constantly so employed, of things done now as of old, circumstances and usages recalling old times, indications of uninterrupted tradition<sup>p</sup>.

§ 7. There is another well-known passage of S. Augustine, in his letter to Honoratus on the Grace of the New Testament<sup>q</sup>, in which he expound the 22nd Psalm from beginning to end. When he comes to verse 30,—one of his objects being to point out how that the grace of the New Testament stood not in temporal, but in eternal promises,—he proceeds as follows:—" 'All they that are rich upon earth have eaten and worshipped: ' by 'the rich upon earth' we are to understand the proud, if we were right before in understanding 'the poor' to mean the humble. . . . For not without significance is the distinction made between them, in that having said before of the poor, *They shall eat and be satisfied*, here, on the contrary, *All the rich of the earth have eaten and worshipped*. For they, too, are brought to the Table of Christ, and receive of His Body and Blood; but they worship only,—they are not also satisfied, because they do not imitate Him. For although they feed on Him that is poor, they disdain to be poor. For *Christ indeed suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow His steps*; but in that *He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the*

<sup>p</sup> Thus the Dial. de Oratoribus in the works of Tacitus, c. 31: "Crassus, Cæsar, Pollio, . . . in early youth dealt with their respective adversaries in those speeches, 'quas hodieque cum admiratione legimus.'" Cicero, in his last Oration against Verres, § 25: "*Hodieque* ('to this day') omnes sic habent persuasum;"—he is speaking of a transaction which had occurred long before. Liv. i. 17: "*Hodieque* in legibus magistratibusque rogandis usurpatur

idem jus, vi adempta." Velleius, i. 4: "*Vires autem veteres earum urbium hodieque magnitudo ostentat mœnium.*" As in each of these phrases both are distinctly expressed, the old object or state of things, and the existing fragment or result of it,—so in the passage under consideration: "the same flesh which the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus Christ, we, *hodieque*, 'down to this day,' adore in the Sacrament."

<sup>q</sup> Ep. xl. § 66, 67.

*death of the cross*, the rich scorn Him, and refuse to suffer CHAP. III.  
the like. . . . But since God hath raised Him from the dead, and given Him the Name which is above every name, . . . they too, moved by the glory of His Name in the universal Church, come to the table, eat AND ADORE; but they are not satisfied, because they do not *hunger and thirst after righteousness*; for such *shall be filled*. . . . By preaching the world has been moved, so that *all the ends of the earth remember themselves and turn unto the Lord, and all the families of the nations worship before Him*. . . . By this enlargement of the Church even the proud, i. e. the rich of the earth, are brought nigh, to eat; and *though not satisfied, yet they adore*."

Here it is much to our purpose to remark how the writer again and again mentions the adoration of all communicants as a matter of course, and universally known; and also as being a signal accomplishment of a prophecy; the very terms of which prophecy make it co-extensive with the whole Church.

§ 8. In the East we have, about the middle of the fifth century, the testimony of Theodoret, published, as is supposed, a few years before the Council of Chalcedon, principally to counteract the heresy then arising, which denied the continuance of Christ's human nature. The passage is well known, being constantly and unanswerably cited as a testimony against the dogma of Transubstantiation, and for that of the Real Objective Presence.

The heretic alleges, that as, by consent of Christians, "the symbols of the Lord's Body and Blood are one thing before the priest's invocation, but after it are changed and become another, so the Lord's Body since His Ascension is changed into the Substance of the Deity". The reply is, "Nay; for it is untrue that after consecration the mystical symbols depart out of their proper nature; remaining as they do in their former substance, and figure, and form, and being visible and tangible, just as they were before. But the inward sense perceives them as being simply what they have become, and so they are the object of faith, and ARE ADORED,

\* Eranistes, Dial. ii. t. iv. 126, ed. Schulze.

CHAP. III. as being those very things which they are believed to be. Compare, accordingly, the image with its archetype, and thou wilt see the resemblance. For the type must needs resemble the reality. And thus that Body, while it hath its former aspect, figure, and outline, and, in one word, its substance *as a Body*, hath nevertheless, since the resurrection, become immortal and incorruptible. It is deemed worthy to sit on the right hand, and is ADORED by the whole creation, as being divinely named the Body of the Lord of nature."

Heretics, it appears, professed to join with the orthodox in every point of this doctrine of the Eucharist. It was taken as an irrefragable, undeniable ground, from which to set out in reasoning on other mysteries. And in respect of the adoration in particular, the worship of Christ's Body by all Christians in the Eucharist is studiously set down as the correlative of the worship of the same Body by all created beings in heaven. And the Church's seal was in a manner set to this doctrine, at least by implication. For had there been any thing at that time supposed heretical in it, there was no lack either of subtle and bitter opponents to expose, or of sound and watchful theologians, like S. Leo, to correct the error: as the most cursory glance at that page of Church history will shew, in which Theodoret's name is one of the most conspicuous, more by the restlessness of his accusers than by any special doings of his own. In fact, it is well known that he was both upholden by S. Leo, and in the Council of Chalcedon restored to his see by acclamation on saying anathema to Nestorius; in whose heresy he had never sympathized, although, from his good opinion of the man, he had been long unable to believe that he meant so much ill, and had shrunk from proceedings which he feared might countenance the opposite error. But let Theodoret have been what he may, the fact that, at such a time, those very public statements of his remained uncensured and uncontradicted, is an additional warrant for our believing that on the Eucharist, at any rate, he did but express the known mind and practice of the holy Church throughout the world.

§ 9. Three centuries after Theodoret's time, in the course

of the controversy on image-worship, we find each several CHAP. III.  
section of the Church bearing its testimony — incidental indeed, but not the less trustworthy—to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the consequent practice of worshipping Him who vouchsafes to be so marvellously present. The parties or sections alluded to are three: the Iconoclasts, who, as is well known, condemned not only the adoration of images and pictures, but all religious use of them; the Image-worshippers, who enforced that adoration under anathema; and a third party, more moderate and apparently more orthodox than either, who justified the use of images as a means of edification, but protested against adoring them. Each had its regular authentic expression in a formal synod: the Iconoclasts at Constantinople, A.D. 754, under the Emperor Constantine Copronymus; the Iconolatæ (so to call them) at Nicæa, in 787, under the patronage of Irene and Constantine her son; and the moderate, or, as it may be called, the Gallican, at Frankfort, in the palace of Charlemagne, in 794. It is obvious that in the course of their discussions the question of Eucharistical Adoration was almost sure incidentally to arise; since that practice also, in one aspect of it, might seem to sanction the worship of sanctified creatures.

Accordingly, we find the Iconoclasts arguing on it as follows:—Having laid down as a principle in a former paragraph, “Where the Soul of Christ is, there also is His Godhead; and where the Body of Christ is, there also no less is His Godhead<sup>s</sup>;” (which saying was allowed by their opponents as a great truth, and the use they proposed to make of it alone disavowed;) they proceed to apply it to the Sacrament of Holy Communion.

“Let them be glad and rejoice, and speak out with all confidence, who frame, and yearn after, and venerate the true Image of Christ with an uncorrupt soul, and who offer it for salvation of soul and body;—which Image our Priest and God (having unreservedly taken to Himself, of us, the lump out of which we are kneaded) did in His own Person deliver to His initiated, at the time of His voluntary Passion,

<sup>s</sup> Harduin, Conc. iv. 361 C.

CHAP. III. for a most evident type and memorial. For being about to yield Himself, of His own accord, to His memorable and life-giving death, He took the Bread and blessed it, and gave thanks and brake it, and distributing it said, 'Take ye, eat, for remission of sins: this is My Body.' Likewise also distributing the Cup He said, 'This is My Blood: this do in remembrance of Me:' as though no other kind or form were selected by Him in the Church under heaven, which should be capable of imaging forth His Incarnation. Behold, then, the Image of His life-giving Body, so richly contrived, and endowed with all honour. For what did the All-wise God devise herein? Even to shew and unfold evidently to us men the mystery wrought out in the dispensation concerning Himself: that even as that which He took of us is simply matter of human substance altogether perfect, not having the lines of a distinct person with independent existence, no additional person thrown as it were into the Divinity; so also He enjoined His Image to be offered in that matter which He selected, even the substance of bread, —not representing the form of a man, lest idolatry creep in unawares.

"Wherefore, as Christ's natural Body is holy, being taken into God<sup>t</sup>, so plainly is His adopted Body also—that is, His holy Image, as being by grace taken into God through a certain sanctification. This, as we said, was the purpose of our Lord Christ: that as He deified the Flesh which He took, from that very union, with the sanctification which was His own by nature, so also the Bread of the Eucharist, being sanctified as a true Image of His natural Flesh by the coming of the Holy Ghost, He willed to become a Divine Body, not without the instrumentality of the Priest, who maketh the offering by transference from that which is common to that which is holy.

"Once more, that natural Flesh of our Lord, animate and gifted with reason, was anointed in respect of His Godhead with the Holy Ghost. So also the divinely ordained Image of His Flesh, the Divine Bread, was filled with the Holy Ghost, together with the Chalice of the life-giving Blood

<sup>t</sup> Θεωθέν.

from His side. This then is revealed as the true Image of CHAP. III.  
the dispensation of Christ our God coming in the flesh, as  
was aforesaid; thus the true Framer and Quickener of our  
nature delivered it unto us with His own lips<sup>u</sup>.”

Without assenting to all their statements and reasonings, thus much one may gather from them in corroboration of what has been said: that with S. Ambrose they applied the expression of S. Paul<sup>v</sup>, “The very Image of the ‘Things,’” to the holy Eucharist; that they regarded the Bread after consecration as not the natural Body of Christ, but yet most truly His Body by some special dispensation; that they worshipped that Body in, or with, or under the Bread, because of the Godhead with which it is inseparably united; that they could not worship the Bread,—it would be mere idolatry,—and therefore Christ would not have His memorial formed into a likeness of Him; and that they considered all this as connected with the doctrine of the Incarnation in such sense, that worshipping Christ’s Humanity as specially present under any other image, would cause confusion in that doctrine. Observe that these were the “Protestants” of the time—watching, as they thought, with a godly jealousy against everything that might look like exaggerated respect to the creature: yet how far do they go in enforcing the adoration which many good men now religiously shrink from!

The opposite party, which proved the dominant one, objected to the term Image as unscriptural in its application to the Eucharist; in which, however, they were incorrect, if S. Ambrose is right in his interpretation of Hebrews x. They allowed the word ‘figures,’ *ἀντίτυπα*, but said it was only applied before consecration,—a most erroneous statement, corrected in the margin by the editors of the Councils, both Roman and Greek; from S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Gregory Nazianzen and others<sup>x</sup>. But these very mistakes being made in their eagerness to glorify the Sacrament as much as they could, it is needless to seek testimonies in favour of adoring the Inward Part of it from them.

The Council of Frankfort, as is notorious, was very plain

<sup>u</sup> Harduin, Cone. iv. 368, 9.

<sup>x</sup> Heb. x. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Harduin, iv. 372 A.

CHAP. III. and express in its condemnation of image-worship. Their second canon is, "The question was mooted of the recent synod of the Greeks, holden at Constantinople, touching the worship of images; wherein it was set down, that such as would not pay service or worship to the images of the saints as to the holy Trinity, should incur an anathema. Our holy Fathers above-mentioned rejected altogether such adoration and service, and that with scorn, and unanimously condemned it<sup>2</sup>." And one of their reasons for rejecting it, alleged afterwards to Pope Adrian, was,—*"It is great rashness and extreme absurdity to be minded to put the said images on a par with the Body and Blood of our Lord<sup>a</sup>."* Herein they adopt the argument of the Iconoclasts, whose decisions they had before them, embodied in those of Nicæa; and shew that they regarded it as a matter of course to adore Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, since otherwise the adoring of images would be no real intrusion on the rights of that Sacrament.

§ 10. Thus we seem to have evidence irresistible that down to the beginning of the ninth century, i. e. through all the ages of comparatively unbroken unity in the Church, the Body and Blood of the Man Christ Jesus—of Him who is God and Man—was adored as present after consecration in the Eucharist; i. e. Christ Himself was adored, as present by the Presence of His Body and Blood. Neither the depravers of the faith on the one hand, nor the maintainers of purity of worship on the other, ever seem to have found any difficulty in that point. Who can help concluding that it came down direct from the Apostles? especially considering what I will venture to call the strong presumption made out in favour of it from Holy Scripture and natural piety. It will have been seen that both S. Ambrose and S. Augustine use expressions and arguments which would be quite unwarrantable, unless they knew the practice to be a real apostolical tradition. S. Ambrose's *"hodieque,"* and S. Augustine's *"Nemo manducat, nisi qui prius adoraverit,"* would be neither of them honest sayings, were they not uttered under that conviction. And their arguments, grounded as

<sup>2</sup> Harduin, iv. 901 D.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. 791 D.

they are on the two great and simple verities of the Incarna- CHAP. III.  
tion and the Real Presence, are of course good for all times  
as well as for their own.

Besides, it is surely hard to imagine how such a serious and awful innovation could have made its way into the most solemn and at the same time the most frequently repeated of all Church ordinances, without some notice or discussion at the time. Other questionable tenets and usages, such as purgatory, the worship of the Virgin, and of saints and images, and the papal supremacy, may be traced in Church history, coming on by degrees, and some of them not without much noisy discussion and conflict: in regard of each one of them a time may be certainly assigned, when it was no part of the necessary teaching of the Church. Not so in respect of this rite of Eucharistical Adoration. There is nothing in early Church history or theology, any more than in Holy Scripture or in the creeds of the Church, to prevent our receiving in their full extent the statements of the fourth century concerning it. It is a case coming naturally and completely under S. Augustine's famous aphorism, "that whatsoever positive order the whole Church everywhere doth observe, the same it must needs have received from the very Apostles themselves, unless perhaps some general council were the authors of it<sup>b</sup>."

§ 11. The only plausible objection, that I know of, to the foregoing statement, arises from the omission of the subject in the primitive Liturgies, which are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ's Body and Blood after consecration. We find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to His holy Humanity so present, nor any rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward.

But with regard to the first, the omission of special collects to our Lord, that it does not negative adoration is demonstrated at once by the twenty-third canon of the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397<sup>c</sup>; at which council S. Augustine was present: and his express testimony to the universal custom of adoration has been here quoted at large.

<sup>b</sup> Hooker, Eccl. Pol. viii. 5. 3, quoting S. Aug. Ep. 108, c. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Harduin, i. 963.

CHAP. III. Yet he was a party to the following enactment: “*Ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filio, vel Filium pro Patre nominet. Et cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio. Et quicumque sibi preces aliunde describit, non eis utatur, nisi prius eas cum instructoribus fratribus contulerit.*” A rule remarkable on many accounts :

First, as a striking illustration of the great liberty allowed for variation of Liturgies in the several dioceses, or even in the several congregations; since it implies, apparently, that every Bishop and Priest might adopt prayers from any quarter, taking good advice upon them. So much the more remarkable is the concurrence of all the Liturgies in so many material points.

Secondly, we see the danger there was under such circumstances of ill-advised language, unawares countenancing the very gravest of doctrinal errors; such as confusing the Persons of the Trinity one with another, naming the Son for the Father, and the Father for the Son.

And thirdly, (which is much to our present purpose,) there is a direct prohibition, for whatever reason, of special prayer to our Lord, as also to the Holy Ghost, in the Communion Office. How is this to be accounted for? Perhaps by recollecting that the *rationale* of the Holy Eucharist is to be a sacrifice offered by the Son to the Father; it is the transference for the time to earth of the great perpetual commemorative sacrifice in heaven; and there might be danger of devout persons not considering this, and obscuring the simplicity of the priestly act by intermingling prayers *to* our Lord with those which are eminently and particularly offered *by* our Lord; He, our Melchisedec, being the true Consecrator, as well as the true Baptizer.

It might seem as though this African rule were far from being invariably observed,—for in the Roman Canon itself, as Bishop Andrewes remarks<sup>d</sup>, there are four collects addressed to our Lord; and among the normal liturgies of the East, that of S. James has three, S. Chrysostom two, S. Basil one; the Persian family, as represented, according to Mr. Neale, by the Liturgy of Theodore the Interpreter,

<sup>d</sup> Minor Works, Ans. to Perron, p. 50, Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.

one only. In the Jacobite liturgies, especially those of CHAP. III.  
Egypt, there appear to be many more. In one, called after S. Gregory, the very prayer of consecration itself is addressed to our Lord. But this seems to be a remarkable exception; and one might almost imagine that the African canon above quoted, though many years earlier, was intended to guard against similar invocations, as obscuring the true doctrine, if not directly tending to error. The other addresses to Jesus Christ above referred to, in the several Anaphoræ, (for I take no account here of the more distant preparation for the sacrifice,) are most of them private, for the use of the priests, or of each communicant; praying to be made worthy, or giving thanks after communion, or (as in S. Chrysostom) deprecating the forfeiture of the gift. The only prayers to our Lord that may be well called public, or congregational, in the Anaphoræ above specified, are the one for the Peace of the Church in the Roman Missal, immediately after the union of the two kinds, and the response of the people following the words of institution in S. James, S. Chrysostom, and S. Basil. Will it be too much to say, that in spite of these exceptions, the clear mind of the Church in her Eucharistical offices has always been to offer the sacrifice directly and immediately to God the Father only? Not as if we were ignorant how inseparable the Persons of the Blessed Trinity are, nor as if we were excluding the Most Holy Son and Spirit from being truly recipients of the Christian Sacrifice,—which kind of error was once censured in the Eastern Church<sup>e</sup>;—but because Holy Scripture everywhere teaches, that it has pleased Him so to order the economy of our redemption, as that each Person shall have His own work therein, to which He is in a certain sense nearer than either of the other two: e. g. in the mystery of the Altar, (which in heaven is the mystery of Christ's Intercession,) the Holy Ghost prepares the Sacrifice, the Son offers it (being His own incarnate Person), and the Father receives it. And by Divine instinct, as it may seem, the holy Church from

\* Neale, *Introd. to Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, i. 434.

CHAP. III. the beginning has been taught to arrange her liturgies in conformity with this.

§ 12. Among the rest, it is obvious to remark that our own reformed Liturgy does not contain any prayer or address to our Lord, until we come to the *Gloria in excelsis* at the end of it. All along, down to that moment, it is as if He, the true Melchisedec, were condescending to officiate among us as Priest, marvellously offering up Himself as a memorial of His death; and where He begins, as it were, to re-ascend, then we begin to call on Him in prayer as well as praise. With S. John we see Him in the "Lamb standing as it had been slain," now taking His place in the midst of the throne<sup>f</sup>; and we salute and beseech Him accordingly; as our King, to have mercy on us, and to receive our prayers in His own right; as our Priest, to receive and present them with His own Eucharistical offering to the Father. And then we lose sight of Him (so to speak), as the Apostles did, behind the cloud of glory, where "He only with the Holy Ghost" is "most high in the glory of God the Father." He departs, but not without a blessing, which He leaves His earthly priest to pronounce in His Name. Ought not all this to be religiously accepted, as one of the many providential tokens that the doctrine of Eucharistical Sacrifice is not abandoned in our Liturgy? God forbid! although by reason of certain deviations from the received language of early times, omission of some things, and transposition of others, the truth of the blessing is less distinctly taught than might have been wished.

§ 13. The above would seem to be a sufficient reason why prayers and collects formally addressed to our Lord should not in general have formed part of the Eucharistical services. But we are not hastily to conclude that He was not intended to be directly worshipped as there present. We have seen that S. Augustine, while discouraging verbal prayers addressed to Him, testifies nevertheless to the fact of His being universally then and there adored, and declares the duty of such adoration:—"We have found out in what sense

<sup>f</sup> Rev. v. 6.

such a Footstool of our Lord may be worshipped, and not CHAP. III.  
only that we sin not in worshipping it, but that we sin in  
not worshipping it."

For adoration is by no means limited, as some appear to imagine, to "the saying of prayers." It was observed of old, in answer to an Arian who would fain argue the inferiority of the Holy Ghost from the saying, "that the Spirit maketh intercession for us<sup>g</sup>:"—"To intercede or pray, is one thing—to adore, another. Whoever prays, asks, but not every one who adores asks. Remember the custom of kings: they are commonly adored" with a civil kind of worship, "and not asked for anything. Sometimes they are asked without being adored." Religious adoration is of the heart, and not of the lips only; it is practised in praise and thanksgiving, as well as in prayer; we adore as often as we approach God in any act of divine faith, hope, or love, with or without any verbal or bodily expression: neither, among postures, is it limited to actual prostration; kneeling, or standing, with inclination of the body, (*venerabiliter curci*<sup>h</sup>), were always accepted in most ancient times as competent attitudes of outward worship.

§ 14. The absence, then, of special prayer to our Lord sacramentally present in the Eucharist proves nothing against His being adored there; although it is not without significance as an indication of the sacrificial import of that ordinance. But what shall we say to the deficiency of rubrics? True it is that the extant copies of ancient liturgies are not without special instances sometimes of express direction to adore, sometimes of what is unmeaning without adoration: as in the Mozarabic, after the consecration, and before the Nicene Creed, "the priest elevates the Body of Christ, that it may be seen by the people<sup>i</sup>;" and the Creed itself is evidently repeated in the way of adoration. In those of the Hierosolymitan family the rubric and prayer of S. Chrysostom run thus<sup>k</sup>:

After the consecration and offering, the priest prays se-

<sup>g</sup> S. Aug. cont. Maxim. Arian. i. 9.

Church, p. 589.

<sup>h</sup> Ep. of [Pseudo] Anastasius, ap.  
Conc. Labbe, ed. Coleti, t. ii. 1429.

Ibid. 630—38; S. Chrys., t. vi.  
1001, ed. Sav.

<sup>i</sup> Neale, Introd. to Hist. of Eastern

CHAP. III. secretly : "Regard, O Lord Jesus Christ our God, out of Thy holy dwelling-place, and from the throne of the glory of Thy kingdom, and come to sanctify us, Thou that sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly with us, and vouchsafe with Thy mighty hand to impart unto us of Thine immaculate Body and precious Blood, and through us to all Thy people." *Then the priest adores, and the deacon in his place, saying secretly thrice, "God be merciful to me a sinner." And the people likewise all reverently adore.* And when the deacon seeth the priest stretching out his hands, and taking hold of the Holy bread in order to make the holy elevation, he says aloud, "Let us attend." And the priest : "Holy things for holy persons." The choir : "There is One Holy, One Lord Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father. Amen."

The corresponding portion of S. James' Liturgy runs thus : —"The priest secretly : 'Holy Lord, who retest in the holy, hallow us by the word of Thy grace, and by the visitation of Thy all-Holy Spirit ; for Thou hast said, O Lord, Be ye holy, for I am holy. Lord, our God, incomprehensible Word of God, consubstantial, coeternal, indivisible, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, receive the pure hymn in Thy holy and spotless Sacrifice, with the cherubim and seraphim, and from me a sinner ;' crying and saying, (*then he elevates the gifts, and saith,*) 'Holy things for holy persons.' *People :* One Holy, one Lord Jesus Christ, in the glory of God the Father, to Whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

And so in S. Mark's, and in the other normal liturgies.

Who can doubt that where the rubric is wanting in the MSS. the rite was nevertheless remembered and practised? the case being one to which the remark of the learned Renaudot is eminently applicable : "To what end write in the Office-books all the points which the priests and deacons were learning every day by practice in their ministry? Many directories of later ages, later than the time to which the Protestants themselves refer the origin of adoration, contain not a single line on the subject. And so it was in the Eastern Churches, where it was com-

paratively late before any rules for the administration of the Sacraments were set down in writing, and the MSS. consisted of prayers only." To the Eucharist, more especially, this saying will apply, because of the peculiar reverence which induced the Christians of the first ages, living so much as they did among the heathen, to veil the sacred mysteries from the knowledge of all but communicants. So that even in the time of S. Basil, as is notorious, the very words of consecration were accounted among unwritten traditions. And we know how commonly, in unauthorized and popular reprints of our own Prayer-book, the rubrics are apt to drop out. CHAP. III.

§ 15. Putting all this together, there is nothing surely in the silence of the Liturgies, so far as they *are* silent, to outweigh the distinct affirmation of so many competent witnesses, backed as they are by intrinsic probability, that the Bread and Wine being once consecrated, the Body and Blood were believed to be present in, with, or under them, and then and there to be adored; and that a certain moment in the celebration was appointed in each Liturgy, sometimes by rubric, oftener by unwritten custom, for such adoration to take place. One very usual time, perhaps the most usual, for this ceremony, was just before the priest communicated, when, having completed the preparation of the holy elements for distribution, he held up one portion of them, to signify to the people that all was ready; at the same time inviting and cautioning them by the words, "Holy things to holy persons." In other cases, as in the Roman Liturgy, the signification takes place immediately after consecration. In our own, the same end is answered by the provision in the rubric, that the bread must be broken, and the cup taken into the priest's hands, *before the people*; besides that there is less occasion for it as a notice, when the Sacrament is ministered in a tongue "understood of the people."

§ 16. It is a question seriously to be asked, Can any one who believes in the Real Presence help adoring, at least inwardly, when he sees or hears either of these signals, or any other equivalent to them. Such an one would need no rubric; and accordingly we find that even in the Canon of the

CHAP. III. Roman Mass, though the celebrant is directed to adore, no such injunction is given to the communicants or assistants. It is taken for granted, as part of the unwritten mind of the Church. And the same observation will apply to those ancient Liturgies which prescribe nothing on the subject, and perhaps, as we shall see by-and-by, to our own.

To me this seems to harmonize beautifully with the tenor of the old services, and of all that are in unison with them,—the English not the least;—with the fact that the very Creed for a long period was not allowed to be put in writing, and so it came to pass that every diocese almost had its own creed, its own wording for the same Articles of belief; with the similar fact as to liturgies and Church offices; with many also of the great social rules and rules of discipline; with the many meanings, or shades of meaning, assigned to the same words of Scripture, under the sanction of the New Testament itself, and its way of interpreting the Old, and using the LXX. version. In all these things, taking all Christendom over from the beginning, there is an endless variety in detail, presupposing a perfect unity in principle, such as one might expect in His work, Who made the visible and material world so various, yet so uniform. And thus, as well as by its freeing us from sin, is the Gospel eminently a law of liberty. So much the more striking is it, when in opinions, or interpretations, or formulæ, or usages, which at first appear substantially diverse, or even inconsistent, we detect a common element animating all, which binds and reconciles all together. Such is the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in respect of everything in the Eucharistic offices and traditions, and eminently in respect of the practice of Adoration.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### TESTIMONY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

§ 1. ALAS! that this great, and blessed, and simple truth should have been so marred in its visible effect, and too often, we may fear, in its intended work on men's souls, by the

restless curiosity of mere investigators, or the mistaken policy CHAP. IV.  
of Church governors; the one speculating, the other defining, on this and other subjects, beyond the lines drawn by Holy Scripture and sacred Antiquity. But this process, be it observed, kept time in a manner with the steps of the unhappy division which the great Enemy was then working out between the Eastern and Western portions of the Church. And so it has come to pass, that for none of the present corruptions, however widely diffused, can it be truly said that there was at any time even a fair semblance of œcumenical authority.

There is no need here to go into the history of Transubstantiation; the introduction of which, erroneously supposed the only alternative with an indevout rationalism, has proved undoubtedly, if not the origin, at least the main aggravation of all our present difficulties on the subject of Holy Communion. But it may be instructive to remark the difference between the course of synodical decision in the Western Church on this point, and the manner in which the full doctrine of the Incarnation had been affirmed by the great Councils in opposition to the conflicting heresies of the fifth century. The undivided Church in the time of Ephesus and Chalcedon was equally on its guard against Nestorius denying the unity of our Lord's Person, and Eutyches denying the truth of His abiding human Nature: the Scripture and the holy Fathers, it was found, and authoritatively declared, were as express and earnest on the one point as on the other. Between the two, the way was marked out without swerving to the right hand or to the left, and all Christendom accepted their witness, and has repeated it all along; with how great a blessing, none may yet know. Who can say how much of the unity in belief which, blessed be God, as yet prevails among us, in spite of so many fretful hearts and undisciplined minds, is due to those solemn assemblies, under the guidance of God's good Spirit?

So it has fared with the doctrine of the Incarnation itself; but it has been far otherwise with the doctrine of the Eucharist,—the extension, as it has been often called, of the Incar-

CHAP. IV. nation, and corresponding to it by a very remarkable analogy. Instead of maintaining with the Fathers the full and true co-existence of both parts of the Sacrament, the Western Church, from about the time of the great schism, has allowed and cherished, and finally enforced by anathema, a notion, apparently corresponding to Eutychianism, that the earthly and inferior part is quite swallowed up of the higher, and ceases to be.

§ 2. Let it be granted that this view—as an English Churchman, I must be allowed to call it this error—unlike the opposite one, which would make the Sacrament a shadow, “destitute, empty, and void of Christ,” has nothing in it that seems immediately profane, and shocking to a religious mind ; nay, more, that it is fully consistent with the very highest contemplations and devoutest breathings of saintly love,—as who can doubt, that has only heard the names of Thomas à Kempis, S. Bernard, S. Anselm, and a hundred others? Yet still, if it be an error, a one-sided formula, a half-truth, on so grave a point of Christian doctrine, it must be an exceeding calamity for any portion of the Church to have committed itself to it ; and in process of time it will be sure, one way or another, to betray itself by the appropriate results of error: the tree will be known by its fruits. And Transubstantiation, like certain views which have found more of a home among ourselves, the views (e.g.) of Calvin or of Wesley, however it may have commended itself to many, in their deep longing to draw as near as possible to their Saviour, must be judged, on a wide view of Church history, and looking to the average sort of believers, to have borne on the whole very evil fruit, both where it is received and where it is not. Within the Roman obedience it has been a scandal to the simpler sort, by “giving occasion to many superstitions,” it being so exceedingly hard for them to separate it from a base and carnal idea of the Holy Sacrament. Among us, and every where in the West apart from Rome, it has proved a still greater scandal ; it is the one chief reason of the prejudice which in these later ages has prevailed, and is prevailing (God grant it may not always prevail), against the

true and primitive doctrine, which is mistaken for it, like CHAP. IV.  
Jehoshaphat in Ahab's robes.

§ 3. It is obvious how this prejudice must tell against the rite of adoration especially. Before the time of Paschasius, when it was said, as by Theodoret or S. Cýril, "the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is to be worshipped," the faithful had been plainly taught that not the outward sign was meant, but that of which the bread was the veil. They no more thought of adoring the bread than S. Mary Magdalen and the Apostles thought of adoring our Lord's garments, when He appeared to them after His resurrection. They worshipped His Divine Person present by the presence of His glorified Humanity: there was no call or need—if they were devout, there was neither time nor wish—to think at all of the manner of the Presence, the earthly substances by which He was pleased to veil Himself. "They had at that time a sea of comfort and joy to wade in, and we by that which they did are taught that this heavenly food is given for the satisfying of our empty souls, and not for the exercising of our curious and subtle wits." But the teaching of Transubstantiation, if realized at the time, forces men to think of the manner of the Presence, and, to subtle minds, must prove so far a hindrance to devotion, if not a temptation to unbelief. So that even among those who most firmly believed it, the refuge of loving hearts has always been to turn away from it as a topic of Eucharistical meditation, and revert unconsciously to the simpler faith of the times before such points had been discussed; as we see, (for example,) in the last book of Thomas à Kempis. And it has been just the same all along on the other side, with those who feel it a matter of conscience to be denying or doubting that mode of Presence. They have hard work to abstain from thinking of their denials and doubtings, when they most wish simply to receive the blessing. Thus Hooker himself, after deprecating "the exercise of our curious and subtle wits" on the holy Eucharist, propounds in the very next paragraph an explanation of the words of institution, which, whether it be more or less correct than the Roman, is surely not less "curious" or scholastic:

CHAP. IV. "My Body, the Communion of My Body; My Blood, the Communion of My Blood. Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that, as Christ is termed our life because through Him we obtain life, so the parts of this Sacrament are His Body and Blood, for that they are so to us, who, receiving them, receive that by them which they are termed? The Bread and Cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it."

The truth is, if one may venture to say it of one so wise, holy, and venerable, that on this subject, as on the apostolical succession, and some others, Hooker was biassed by his respect for Calvin and some of his school, in whose opinions he had been educated, and by sympathy with the most suffering portion of the foreign Reformers, so as instinctively and unconsciously to hide his eyes from the unquestionable consent of antiquity, and to make allowances which, logically carried out, would lead to conclusions such as the ancient Church never could have endured. In this part of his treatise especially, many a thoughtful reader has doubtless wondered, not without some disappointment, at the manner in which he winds up his enunciation of the doctrine of the Eucharist, after such an outpouring of himself in the most glowing words and most transcendental thoughts of the deepest and most eloquent of the Fathers:—"The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." Why? not because we are so warned by consent of the ancient Church; not because the words of Holy Scripture are irreconcilable with such an opinion; but because, as it may seem to us, all the purposes of the holy Eucharist may be answered without supposing an objective Presence; an argument which, besides other difficulties, obviously assumes that we know *à priori* all the purposes of the holy Eucharist. At the same

time, it should be carefully observed that he does not enforce CHAP. IV.  
this view as necessary, nor say any thing exclusive against  
the Lutherans, but only that "they ought not to stand in it  
as in a matter of faith, nor to make so high account of it."  
And then how strikingly beautiful is the conclusion to which,  
after all, he recurs, his mind floating upward again to its  
congenial element of love! and how aptly do his words  
shadow forth the impression which would be left on a duti-  
ful heart by the simple consideration of what Holy Scripture  
and ancient authors wrote of the tenet which he shrank  
from—the Real Objective Presence in sacrifice as well as in  
Sacrament, before the unhappy refinement of Transubstan-  
tiation came in!—"Where God Himself doth speak those  
things, which either for height and sublimity of matter, or  
else for secrecy of performance, we are not able to reach  
unto, as we may be ignorant without danger, so it can be no  
disgrace to confess we are ignorant. Such as love piety will  
as much as in them lieth know all things that God com-  
mandeth, but especially the duties of service which they owe  
to God. As for His dark and hidden works, they prefer, as  
becometh them in such cases, simplicity of faith before that  
knowledge which, curiously sifting what it should adore, and  
disputing too boldly of that which the wit of man cannot  
search, chilleth for the most part all warmth of zeal, and  
bringeth soundness of belief many times into great hazard."  
It cannot surely be wrong to wish that, in this spirit, the  
true spirit of holiness, all priests may speak, and all Chris-  
tians hear, the holy words, "THIS is My Body; THIS is My  
BLOOD;" and if they so speak and hear, how can they help  
inwardly adoring, even at the very time of consecration?  
seeing that He does not say, "This *will* to *you* and in *you*  
be My Body;"—that is the gloss, not the text;—but He  
says simply and positively, "This is My Body;" and again,  
"This is My Blood."

§ 4. But you fear to surrender yourself to this impulse—  
you fear to adore before you eat—lest you should be un-  
awares committing yourself to a kind of idolatry, in wor-  
shipping Bread and Wine; or to a gross material conceit,  
like that which our Lord reproved in the multitude at Caper-

CHAP. IV. naum; as though, if the sight were not miraculously withheld, they would behold Him corporally in His human form and features; and how then could they dare partake of Him? We have too much reason to believe that the latter of these errors has been, perhaps is still, too common among the uneducated in neighbouring countries; and as to the former, it is involved in the very notion of Transubstantiation, supposing that notion untrue. To worship the outward part of the Sacrament must, of course, (to use a school distinction,) be *material* idolatry in their eyes who have learned and believe that it is true Bread and Wine; although in those whose faith teaches them that there is really no outward part, that the holy Body and Blood are alone present, such worship can hardly be *formal* idolatry, nor in any degree (we may hope) incur the guilt thereof. No wonder, however, if the mind, haunted by this idea, shrink more or less from the thought of any worship in the Eucharist. And yet, when we reflect on it in earnest, how can the heart help worshipping? The remedy must be, to place yourself, by God's help, with courageous faith, in the same posture of mind with the ancient undivided Church before these theories were invented; simply to adore, from simple conviction of Christ's presence. For many generations all good Christians did so without fear or scruple: not because they were unaware of the possibility of these later errors, for they were distinctly warned against them by their teachers; Theodoret, as against Transubstantiation, declaring that "the mystical symbols in no wise depart from their proper nature; for they remain in their former substance, and figure, and kind, and are visible and tangible, just as they were before<sup>1</sup>;" S. Augustine, as against Carnal Presence, pointing to our Lord's cautionary words: "When thou adorest Him, lest thy mind linger in the flesh and thou fail to be quickened by the Spirit, 'It is the Spirit,' saith He, 'that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' . . . Some of His disciples . . . took foolishly what He had said; they had carnal thoughts of it, and imagined that our Lord was to separate certain particles from His own Body, to give unto them. . . . But the

<sup>1</sup> Eranistes, Dial. ii., ed. Schulze, t. iv. p. 126.

Twelve having remained, He instructed them, and said unto CHAP. IV. them, 'The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.' Understand what I have said to you spiritually; it is not this Body which you see, that you are to eat, nor to drink that Blood which they will shed who shall crucify Me. It is a certain Sacrament which I have entrusted to you; spiritually understood, it will give you life. Though it must needs be visibly celebrated, it is meet to be thought of as something invisible<sup>m</sup>."

Theodoret and S. Augustine, be it observed, are two of the most express witnesses to the adoration of Christ's Body in the Eucharist.

§ 5. It will be said—it has been said again and again; it was the primary argument of those who were accounted "sober Churchmen" a century ago—that it might be very well for the primitive Christians to speak such language as they did, and practise such ceremonies, but that the mischiefs in which that course eventually issued were a providential warning to us not to tread in their steps. And no doubt there are cases to which this topic may and ought to be applied. But they must be cases of detail, not of principle. The Church must look well to it, that in no instance the opinion or rite surrendered be such, as that the loss of it shall materially damage any of the great truths or duties committed to her charge. To take instances from the ritual of the Eucharist itself: the suppression of the apostolical feasts of charity, or, in later times, of the kiss of peace, no one, under the circumstances, would think of deprecating. But it is far otherwise when we are dealing with such great fundamental matters as the Real Presence, and adoration consequent upon it. The doctrine, if revealed at all, is revealed for ever; the homage, if due at first, must be due always; it cannot be innocently suspended or done away. For the observation of Bishop Butler on the worship of the Second and Third Persons of the Most Holy Trinity—in what sense it is a moral duty—may be applied with much seeming reason to this case. "The worship," he may be understood to say, "the internal worship itself," before defined to be "the re-

<sup>m</sup> In Ps. 98 [99], § 9.

CHAP. IV. ligious regards of reverence, honour, love, trust, gratitude, fear, hope," to Christ present in the holy Eucharist, "are no farther matter of pure revealed command, than as the fact of" that Presence "is matter of pure revelation; for the fact being known, the obligations to such inward worship are obligations of reason arising out of the fact itself<sup>n</sup>."

Should abuses then occur, they must be met by explanation; but far be it from the Church of God to permit any abuse of man to take away the use of His merciful gifts. That would be simply lending ourselves to the purposes of the crafty One who prompted the abuse. To him it is all one, if he can but turn you away from Christ, whether he do so by unauthorized veneration and worship, or by unloving and faithless fear of that which is authorized. Just as in the period of the great Œcumenical Councils, he cared not to make men Nestorians rather than Eutychians. His single point was to disturb, at all events, their faith in our Lord's Incarnation. And how did undivided Christendom meet him? By simply and steadfastly abiding in the old ways. Courageous in their charity, and charitable in their courage, they held fast the whole truth, only guarding it on the right hand and on the left by needful and considerate explanations; yet not they, "but the grace of God which was with them."

§ 6. To what extent that grace may have been forfeited and withdrawn, by reason of the manifold sins and divisions of God's people in the following ages, we can but surmise with fear and trembling. But we of the Reformed Church of England are most surely bound by a deep debt of gratitude to Him, who in most critical times so overruled the course of religious change in this country, as to preserve us in many signal instances from most imminent peril of giving up something essential for dread of accidental error. One of these instances, if I take it aright, is the matter of adoration in the Eucharist.

For what in very deed is the drift of the Admonition at the end of our Liturgy, so often quoted as forbidding all adoration? Take the words in their literal and grammatical sense: "It is ordained in this Office for the Administration

<sup>n</sup> Anal., p. ii. c. 1. Works, Oxf. 1807, vol. i. p. 212.

of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive CHAP. IV.  
the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue)."

Kneeling, in a church, and in divine worship, is a posture surely of adoration—one of the three recognised postures; and where it is especially prescribed, *some* especial adoration must be intended. To whom? and for what? The words themselves of the protestation answer the latter question. We kneel in receiving "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers."

The grammar of this may be a little uncertain; i. e. it does not quite clearly appear whether Christ Himself, or His benefits, are said to be given in the Sacrament. But in meaning and effect the phrases are plainly equivalent. Coming worthily, we are therein "partakers of Christ,"—of Christ present in His human nature by the presence of His Body and Blood,—a Presence hidden from us, but certified by the consecrated bread and wine which we do see. All who believe this—and this surely is no more than the Catechism plainly teaches us all,—must they not of course feel, that in kneeling down to receive the Holy Communion, they are in fact kneeling to Him who is come to give Himself to them; kneeling to His Person, to His human nature, to His Body and Blood; as truly, verily, and indeed, as if they had been kneeling on Calvary itself, at the foot of the real Cross?

And who shall dare to come and tell them that in so feeling, so bowing before that Presence, in the most perfect homage their hearts can attain to, they are going beyond the rule of "humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, therein given to all worthy receivers?" The real question is, what is the benefit received? If it be Christ Himself, not His grace and help only, surely "humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ" cannot mean less than adoration.

CHAP. IV. I must take leave then to say, that granting the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, Adoration is not only permitted, but enjoined by the Church of England in her Prayer-book. Those who would prove that she prohibits the one, must first make out that she denies the other; which they can never do as long as her Catechism and her Communion-office remain.

§ 7. But now mark how wisely and charitably, guided, no doubt, by God's good providence, our Anglican Church, in asserting for her children the full right and duty of simple and primitive worship, disavowed on their behalf errors which experience had shewn were likely to be laid to their charge, and provided them also with a ritual rule, which would guard them from seeming to fall either into those errors or the contrary. The rule is most simple, yet most effective; it is just this,—that whereas in the Church generally great freedom had been allowed to communicants to adore in what posture they would; standing generally, at least on festivals, in the first ages, afterwards for the most part kneeling, but with permission to those who felt such an impulse, to prostrate themselves in the mysterious Presence;—this liberty is now so far curtailed among us, that we are all (if health allow) bound to receive *kneeling*; which, being on the one hand a posture of adoration, answers the purpose of a humble and grateful acknowledgment; on the other hand, it avoids the semblance of that worship which to most men's fancy had unhappily come to imply belief in Transubstantiation. It also guards against a certain "profanation and disorder," not of course intentional, but sure to occur, where some kneel and others fall prostrate; as well as against the worse profanation of sitting, or using other careless postures, according to the custom of those Christians who have a superstitious fear of the Real Presence.

Nay, and there is something to be said of it yet more serious, so serious, that I will repeat it, though it has been mentioned above. What Hooker writes of the customs of standing up when the Gospel is read, and of bowing at the Name of Jesus, seems even more applicable to the rite of adoration in the Holy Communion; "Against infidels,

Jews, Arians,"—he might have added, Nestorians—"who CHAP. IV.  
derogate from the honour of Jesus Christ, such ceremonies are most profitable." And accordingly "it is observed by the Polish Church in their 'Consensus,' that 'the men who lapsed there into the Arian heresy were all such as addicted themselves to the posture of sitting at the Communion.'"

And no wonder; for in refusing to adore on that occasion, (supposing them to know what they did,) they had betrayed themselves at least to be very imperfect believers; there being no one outward act which does so entirely gather up, as it were, the whole Catholic faith in one, and declare it before the eyes of men, as receiving the holy Eucharist with a gesture of adoration. This any one may easily understand, who will just go through in his mind the several articles of that faith, and pause to consider how each one is symbolized in, or associated with, the Great Sacramental Rite. For instance: by receiving His creatures of Bread and Wine, we acknowledge Him (as S. Irenæus argues) Creator of heaven and earth, against all sorts of Manicheans: receiving Christ's Body is confessing His Incarnation; and adoring it, His Divinity; it is the memorial of His Death, and the participation of that Sacrifice which supposes Him raised and ascended into heaven; it is obeying His command, so to shew forth His death *till He come*; it is drinking "into one Spirit;" it is partaking of that "one Bread" which makes us "one Body," the Holy Catholic Church; it is "the Communion of Saints;" it is the Blood shed "for the remission of sins;" it is the last Adam coming to be in us a quickening spirit, to seal us for "the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting."

§ 8. For reasons such as these, as we may well imagine, the Church of England in 1661 declined either to abolish or to leave optional the rite of kneeling to receive the holy Eucharist, but rather desired to retain it with cautionary words. And the cautionary words are evidently intended not so much for the communicants themselves, as for others who might be inclined to misinterpret the ceremony. The framers of them clearly indicate that they would have been

° L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, c. vii. p. 323.

CHAP. IV. best pleased simply to leave those committed to their charge to follow the dictates of natural piety, which, of course, would lead them to adore. But knowing the misconstructions which are abroad, they charitably protest "that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." This is not the language of persons intending to negative *all* idea of *any* adoration *whatever* in the Eucharist. Had such been the mind of the Reformers, it was easy for them to speak it out; they might simply have said, "No adoration is intended unto the Sacrament, or either part of it." But what they have really said amounts to this: We not only permit, but enjoin, all communicants to worship Christ present by the peculiar mystery of the Sacrament; and all objectors are desired to take notice that this implies neither Transubstantiation, nor any sort of natural and local presence. For as to Transubstantiation, "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." And as to material Presence, "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." That Body which was seen by S. Stephen, S. Paul, and S. John, "is in heaven, and not here." As a true natural Body, it is one, and it has its own dimensions and outline, whereby it was recognised by those blessed disciples; and in respect of that form (to use the words of Aquinas), "the Body of Christ is not but in one place only, i. e. in heaven<sup>p</sup>."

These two errors then are excluded, viz. such a change in the Bread and Wine as would destroy the Sacrament, by annihilating its outward part; and such a "diffusion<sup>q</sup>" of the Lord's Body into all places as would make it cease to be His own true natural Body. But no kind nor degree of worship, as towards the inward part of the Sacrament, apart from those errors, is in any degree censured or for-

<sup>p</sup> iv. d. 10, l. ad 5, t. xii. 193.

<sup>q</sup> See Hooker, Eccl. Pol., V. lv. 6.

bidden; on the contrary, such worship is, as we have seen, CHAP. IV. implicitly commanded in the preamble of the Admonition. It is as if the Church should say, "You see me and my children adoring,—of course we must do so, since we know and believe that here are verily and indeed present the Body and Blood of the Lord, to be taken and received by the faithful; but you are not therefore to tax us with this or that human interpretation, which we hereby renounce." Is this unduly straining the expressions of the protestation? I think not, for obvious and well-known reasons.

§ 9. First, the significant change in the words of the document,—the history of which appears to be as follows. In the beginning of the second year of Edw. VI., March 8, 1548, a "Communion-book" was issued, pending the complete revision of Church Offices, which was known to be going on; in which book the rubric at the time of receiving is, "Then shall the priest rise, the people still reverently kneeling."

In the end of the second year, or beginning of the third, the first Prayer-book became law, in the Communion-office of which no direction for the posture was given; but in "certain notes" at the end of the book we read, "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures; they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth, without blame."

It would appear that this licence tended, on the whole, to irreverence: it could hardly be otherwise, seeing that before it was granted, proclamations and acts of parliament to check profane talking about Holy Communion had been thought necessary by King Edward's bishops and counsellors, and in 1553 especially, encouragement had been given to Alasco, and other earnest importers of low Zuinglianism. From incidental sayings here and there in Strype, we may imagine to what lengths the evil had gone: and it may have been the apprehension of it, joined probably to the influence of Ridley, which caused the revisers of 1552 positively to enjoin reception in a kneeling posture; though they could not but be well aware, what fierce and lasting opposition that rubric was likely to encounter. Puritanism

CHAP. IV. was too evidently in the atmosphere for such discerning watchers to be ignorant of it, and by this we may perceive how serious a principle they judged to be involved in the step they were taking.

The new Prayer-book, thus enjoining, as I should say, adoration of the inward part of the Sacrament, and so, if Strype speak truly, interpreted by many, came into use by act of parliament on All Saints' Day, 1552<sup>r</sup>. "But because the posture of kneeling was excepted against by some, and the words used by the priest to the communicant at the reception of the Bread gave scruple, as though the adoration of the Host were intended; therefore, to take off this, and to declare the contrary to be the doctrine of this Church, October 27, a letter was sent from the Council to the Lord Chancellor, to cause to be joined to the Book of Common Prayer, lately set forth, a declaration signed by the King, touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion."

It is remarkable, and may serve to indicate a great conflict of opinion in the council, that although the act establishing the new Liturgy had passed before April 16, it was not until October 27, just four days before the book was to come into use, that the government made up their minds to insert this protestation. Of course, so inserted by order of council only, it had no authority of parliament. A convocation was summoned for the following September, but the king's death in July prevented its assembling. So far, the protestation we are considering had neither the authority of the Church nor of the State.

§ 10. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, it came of course into discussion with the other contents of King Edward's Book. But in that revision it was omitted, and the rubric for kneeling simply retained, without any explanation, although it appears from a paper in Strype<sup>s</sup> that the posture of the communicant was left free—free, that is, as between standing and kneeling (both which are postures of adoration)—in the first draft of the bill prepared by the divines for parliament. As far as Strype knew, the single emendation adopted by the first parliament of Elizabeth in the Common Prayer as

<sup>r</sup> Life of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 33.

<sup>s</sup> Ann. I. i. 122; ii. 461.

submitted to them, was making the posture of kneeling compulsory. And according to all the experience of that reign, we may well suppose this due to the influence of the Queen; and it may perhaps be set down (especially if we connect it with the omission of the explanatory note of King Edward's council) as one of the instances in which Elizabeth's Catholic tendencies succeeded in counteracting the exclusiveness of many of her people and some of her ministers. It betokens the same faith in the Real Presence, and sympathy with those who maintained it, as did the cross and lights which she continued in her private chapels, in spite of so many remonstrances from her chaplains of the Frankfort and Genevan schools, and from her councillors, who feared their influence with the people. Nor can we in any more probable way account for the remarkable enactment and rubric—just now the object of so much attention—which have been supposed to form the standard of our ritual in such matters:—"The minister at the time of Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of parliament in the second year of King Edw. VI., according to the act of parliament set forth in the beginning of this Book."

This second of Edward VI. is precisely the last year in which the ritual of the unreformed Church was in the realm by authority of parliament: I mean, of course, in all matters which had not been specially interfered with. For the First Book of Edward, the first reformed Liturgy, did not come in use by authority of parliament until Whitsunday, 1549, which fell far within the *third* year of Edward VI. Therefore, strange as the assertion may sound, and unadvisable as, of course, it would be to affect to carry it out, it would perhaps be true to say, that the Church ornaments and furniture *then* common here, and *now* among the Lutherans, were not only tolerated, but enacted under penalties by the law of England in Elizabeth's time. One cannot suppose so wide and serious an enactment, touching so many, as it were, in the apple of their eye, to have passed in mere inadvertence. What more probable than that the Queen, as her known inclination and after conduct would lead us to expect, threw her weight—de-

CHAP. IV. ciseive, of course—into the scale of those who wished to preserve or restore the old ornaments, and that the arrangements of her private chapel were intended to be strictly conformable to the law so interpreted? Thus, when Parker first, and afterwards Cox and others, remonstrated with her on those practices, we do not find it alleged by them that her Majesty was violating the law of the land: yet this would surely have been among their topics, had they put the same construction on the rubric which has since become familiar to us. Their arguments are all drawn from the second commandment, the peril of idolatry, and the like. And when they would proceed in their dioceses against the obnoxious ornaments, we find them obtaining “injunctions from the Queen’s Majesty,”—I suppose under the last part of the twenty-fifth clause of the Act of Uniformity; which seems to imply that if she withheld her injunction the ornament would not be illegal: otherwise each bishop might have acted at once for himself.

§ 11. Under such a state of the law, and with such a disposition on the part of the sovereign, began the long years of conflict with Puritanism, throughout which this question of the receiver’s posture at Holy Communion supplied an outward and visible symbol of the deep doctrinal differences which were really at issue. And when the Prayer-book came once again under authoritative review at the Restoration, then, and not until then, (it being determined that the posture of kneeling should still be compulsory,) was the Admonition of 1552 adopted by the Church in Convocation, as part of our present Prayer-book, and legalized, as all men know, by the second Act of Uniformity.

It may be asked why, if the tenor of that Admonition be really so favourable, as I have now alleged, to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to legitimate adoration, was it rejected by Queen Elizabeth, and by the parliament under her influence? In answer, it may be sufficient to refer to one brief but pregnant alteration, familiar to all who have looked at the history of the Prayer-book, which the divines of 1662 made in the document before they adopted it. *King Edward’s Council* had said, “We do declare that it is not

meant thereby that any adoration is done or ought to be CHAP. IV.  
done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there  
bodily received, or to any *real and essential Presence* there  
being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." But *the Church*  
*of England* in the Prayer-book of 1662 declared, and still  
continues to declare, the same concerning any *corporal*  
*Presence*. "Corporal" is not equivalent to "real and es-  
sential." It is not only associated with grosser and more  
carnal ideas, but in its strict philosophical meaning implies  
also something local, in the sense of filling a certain space;  
*οἰκείαν περιγράφην*, the form of His glorious Body. "Real,"  
"substantial," "essential," imply nothing of the kind. They  
express our faith in the miracle, without in the least pre-  
tending to indicate the manner of it. By the very change  
liberty is left, and must have been intended to be left, to  
adore Him, as the Catechism had taught us to believe Him,  
really, substantially, essentially present. That permission is  
as plainly implied as the prohibition to worship Him "cor-  
porally" present is expressed. Such, no doubt, was the  
meaning of divines like Ridley in 1552; but the form which  
they were led to adopt was unfortunately capable of a much  
more questionable interpretation; and it is probable, too, that  
Queen Elizabeth, both in principle and in policy, would wish  
to leave such questions open, as far as might be, on the  
Roman as well as on the Lutheran side; and for the same  
reason that the Thirty-nine Articles, and amongst them  
the sentence against Transubstantiation, were not entirely  
adopted by the Church of England until 1571, this decla-  
ration also might be advisedly omitted.

§ 12. We can hardly be wrong in this interpretation of  
the clause in question; for it is the interpretation of the  
very divines who had the chief hand in that last revision of  
the Liturgy. Bishop Cosin, c. g., in his first set of Notes on  
the Prayer-book<sup>1</sup>, feared not to say, "It is confessed by all  
divines, that upon the words of consecration the Body and  
Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so  
exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this not  
after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and in-

<sup>1</sup> Works, Anglo-Cath. Lib., v. 131.

СТАВ. IV. visible and incomprehensible manner: but yet there remains this controversy among some of them; whether the Body of Christ be present only in the use of the Sacrament, and in the act of eating, and not otherwise. They that hold the affirmative, as the Lutherans (in Conf. Saxon.) and all Calvinists do, seem to me to depart from all antiquity, which places the Presence of Christ in the virtue of the words of consecration and benediction used by the priest, and not in the use of eating of the Sacrament; for they tell us that the virtue of that consecration is not lost, though the Sacrament be reserved, either for sick persons or other. Whereupon Cassander, quoting S. Cyril on S. Luke, saith, 'They are mad who say that the mystical benediction of the Sacrament ceaseth, or loseth its virtue, if any remains stand over for days to come; for the holy Body of Christ will not be changed, but the virtue of the benediction and the life-giving grace is perpetual in it.' And this did most of the Protestants grant and profess at first, though now the Calvinists make popish magic of it in their licentious blasphemy."

Here it is very observable, that Cosin adopts (it must have been on purpose) the very phrase which King Edward's Council, or rather Bucer speaking through them, had recommended the Church of England to disown and deprecate. Bucer wanted to make us all say, "No adoration is done, or ought to be done, . . . unto any *real* and *essential* Presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." Cosin says, "The Body and Blood of Christ is *really* and *substantially* present."

So far, at any rate, Bishop Cosin continued in the same mind, when he bore his part—apparently, a principal part—in the arrangement of our present Liturgy. And in his third series of Notes on the Prayer-book, v. 480, he remarks with evident satisfaction, that "this rubric, by the tenor of it, seems to be no part of the Prayer-book;" not being, it would seem, aware of its history, but struck, as any one might be, with the expression, so and so "is ordered in the *Book of Common Prayer*;" not at all a natural way of speaking, if the sentence were itself part of the book.

At a later period Cosin quotes from Calixtus, with general CHAP. IV.  
 approbation, the following sentence: "Dum accipiant, in genua procumbentes, Christum Dominum, qui præsens eis digne edentibus et bibentibus adest, suumque corpus manducandum, et sanguinem bibendum exhibet, venerantur et adorant; non quidem elementa in sacramentum significata, quæ adoranda non sunt, sed ipsum Dominum et Deum nostrum Jesum Christum." This, I own, Cosin qualifies so as to limit the Presence to the faithful receiver, and to the very moment of receiving; and so far he withdraws his former, and, as I conceive, his more primitive, opinion; still, however, implying, that wherever there is Sacramental Presence there cannot but be special adoration, only not directed to the outward part or sign, but to the thing signified,—Christ's Person, present by the Presence of His Body and Blood.

Whatever he withdrew, it is plain that he had not withdrawn his faith in the Real and Substantial Presence, and in the dutiful necessity of adoring our Lord so present. Nor is it irrelevant to remark, that had Cosin had his own way in all points, the order of our Liturgy would have been brought as near to that of King Edward's first Book as the Scottish and American are now. In particular, the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer would have come between Consecration and Communion. This we may surely consider to be a clear indication what he thought of the doctrine of Eucharistical Sacrifice. And we may infer that he never would have sanctioned our present order, had he regarded it as inconsistent with that doctrine.

And with regard to the first-quoted passage, in which Cosin had asserted not only a Real and Substantial, but also a Real Objective Presence from the moment of consecration; it may be neutralized *on that point*, as far as he is concerned, by what he afterwards wrote; but this does not destroy the force of the same passage as an evidence of *Bishop Overall's* mind on the subject. Cosin, as is well known, was Overall's chaplain and disciple; and to him, in the first set of Notes especially, he all along refers with entire reverence. We may take it for granted that on such a point Cosin, in his earlier days, would not speak positively without his master;

CHAP. IV. and may conclude with some confidence that Overall held strongly the doctrine of Christ's Presence immediately after consecration, and not in the faithful receiver only.

And Overall is the author of the section on Sacraments in the Catechism. He it is who has taught us all from our childhood, that Christ's Body and Blood are the inward part of the Lord's Supper, coëxisting with the outward part—the Bread and Wine, over which the words of Christ have been spoken by one who is for that purpose as Christ Himself.

§ 13. There were other revisers in 1661, whose views on this subject are either declared by themselves, or may be with tolerable certainty conjectured from other facts known concerning them. Bishop Wren, of Ely, for example, at whose house, by reason of his extreme age, the conferences were held, had been one of those most prominent in acting under Laud, and enduring persecution with him for Christ's altar's sake. Now Laud's principle was, "The altar is the greatest place of God's residence upon earth—greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis *Hoc est Corpus meum* . . . but in the other it is at most but *Hoc est verbum meum*; and a greater reverence is due to the Body than to the Word of the Lord<sup>u</sup>." But "When this reverence is performed, 'tis to God as to the Creator, and so divine; but 'tis only 'toward,' not 'to' the altar, and so far short<sup>x</sup>." This is just the principle of kneeling at the Eucharist, as explained in the Protestation of 1661. That reverence is done "to" the Body and Blood, as to the Person of Christ there present in a special way; but only "toward," not "to," the elements, and "so far short." Or, as it is less quaintly expressed in the Scottish Canons of 1636, ch. vi. can. 6<sup>y</sup>: "Superstition and profaneness are both of them extremities to be avoided: as therefore the adoration of the bread is condemned, so the unreverent communicating, and not discerning of those holy mysteries, must be eschewed. Therefore it is ordained, that the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be received with the bowing of the knee, to testify the devotion and thankfulness of the receivers for that most excellent gift."

<sup>u</sup> Laud's Works, A C.L. iv. 281.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. 285.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. v. 574.

§ 16. If Bishop Wren may be justly regarded as an ex-<sup>CHAP. IV.</sup>ponent of Laud's doctrine, Bishop Henechman of Salisbury, another of the revisers, may seem to stand in the same relation to George Herbert. This is Walton's statement concerning them. At the time of Mr. Herbert's being ordained priest, "the Rev. Dr. Humphrey Henechman, now Lord Bishop of London, (who does not mention him but with some veneration for his life and excellent learning), tells me he laid his hand" (being then a prebendary of Salisbury) "on Mr. Herbert's head, and alas! within three years lent his shoulder to carry his dear friend to the grave." Now Collier says of the same Bishop Henechman, "He is reported well acquainted with the Fathers and Councils." He at the Savoy Conference "discoursed with great temper, but was strongly against large abatements and schemes of comprehension. This prelate, together with Sheldon and Morley, is said to have had the chief management of this affair<sup>2</sup>." One should not expect from this, that Bishop Henechman would fail to sympathize with Herbert on such a point as the Real Presence. Now what Herbert thought of that doctrine, and of the consequent practice of adoration, has been shewn already, and may be further judged of by what follows:—"The Country Parson . . . especially at Communion-times, is in great confusion, as *being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him*. Neither finds he any issue in this, but *to throw himself down at the throne of grace*, saying, 'Lord, Thou knowest what Thou didst, when Thou appointedst it to be done thus; therefore do Thou fulfil what Thou didst appoint: for Thou art not only the Feast, but the way to it<sup>a</sup>.'"

Bishop Earle, then Dean of Worcester, another friend and neighbour of Herbert's, was on the commission for discussing the Prayer-book with the Presbyterians. So was Sparrow, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, who, in his "Rationale of Common Prayer," p. 236, gives the following account of the posture enjoined at the Eucharist: "It is to be given to the people KNEELING; for a sin it is not to adore when we receive this Sacrament." "And the old custom was to receive it after

<sup>2</sup> ii. 885, fol.

<sup>a</sup> c. 22.

CHAP. IV. the manner of adoration." For which he quotes S. Augustine and S. Cyril.

Bishop Nicholson, also of Gloucester, one of the final revisers, writes thus of the holy Eucharist: "Christ is there under the forms of Bread and Wine, not changed in substance, but in use<sup>b</sup>."

But it is needless to multiply single testimonies, since we are able to cite the allegation of the members of that venerable commission as a body<sup>c</sup>. "As to the posture of kneeling, they argue, it best becomes the solemnity of the holy Eucharist; that the most valuable blessings are to be received with the greatest marks of reverence and submission: that postures of familiarity are not acceptable to God Almighty upon so solemn an occasion, may be collected from Malathi i. 6, 8. That when the Church used standing at her prayers<sup>d</sup>, the manner of receiving was *more adorantium*. That since this posture of standing has been disused, and kneeling practised instead of it; since this circumstance is thus altered by the Church's appointment, to stand at the Communion now, when we kneel at prayers, would be by no means decent; neither was it ever the custom of the best times<sup>e</sup>." Here the two references to S. Augustine and S. Cyril, and the phrase *more adorantium*, sufficiently shew that they who first gave Church authority among us to Bucer's amended protestation, intended by the rule of kneeling at Holy Communion, the very same thing which the Fathers meant when they spoke of worshipping "the earth which our Lord took of the Virgin Mary,"—His Body and Blood, sacramentally but most truly present, along with, but distinct from, the consecrated elements.

§ 15. It is plain that any passages bearing on the question of Adoration, either in the Liturgy itself, or in the other portions of the Prayer-book, or in the Articles or Homilies, were intended to be read by the light of this protestation, the latest authoritative statement of the Church of Eng-

<sup>b</sup> Expos. of the Catechism, 178, Mystag. 5.  
A.C.L.

<sup>c</sup> Collier, ii. 883.

<sup>d</sup> "S. Aug. Ps. 98; Cyril, Catech.

<sup>e</sup> This is Collier's abstract: the very words are in Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences, 350.

land on the subject. In the revised Liturgy, for example, CHAP. IV. significant changes were made, (as all men know,) at least in four important portions of the Office. First, in the preliminary exhortation, the words of King Edward's second Prayer-book, copied in that of Elizabeth, are, "He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, *as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word as by the holy Sacraments of His blessed Body and Blood.*" In 1662 this was altered to the present form, "To be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament." The change from "by" to "in," and the omission of the saying about God's Word, introduce an obvious and important meaning: the same, no doubt, with the corresponding clause in the first Prayer-book of King Edward,—"*He hath not only given His Body to death, and hath shed His Blood, but also doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament or Mystery, to give us His said Body and Blood to feed upon spiritually.*"

There is, secondly, the direction to the priest himself to set the Bread and Wine on the altar-table, under the name of oblations, with a petition for their acceptance.

Thirdly, the rubric for celebration adds or restores the following particulars:—that the prayer is called the Prayer of Consecration; that the priest is to stand *before* the table; that he is to break the Bread and take the Cup into his hands *before the people*, doing the acts, as well as saying the words, with which our Lord consecrated at first. We may add the restoration of the words, "the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," to the form of distribution.

Fourthly, in the Post-Communion, (what, on reflection, appears very significant,) our present Liturgy is the only English one which provides for the covering of the consecrated Bread and Wine, if any be left, with a fair linen cloth, and for the reverent eating and drinking of it by the priest and some of the communicants. Whereas the last rubric of Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy says simply, "If any of the Bread and Wine remain, the priest may have it to his own use;" making no difference between consecrated and unconsecrated.

CHAP. IV. Surely these details, taking them one with another, are such as not simply to add decency to the celebration, but likewise to recall and bring out the ideas of a real Sacrifice and a real Presence, before (in the judgment of the revisers) too much obscured. And those are not ideas to be forgotten or put aside, when the person impressed with them kneels to receive the Sacrament. If he believe and consider, he cannot choose but adore.

§ 16. And now, what was said before of the Scriptural argument may with some reason, perhaps, be repeated here ; that some very distinct and positive prohibition ought to be produced from some document of equal authority with the Prayer-book, before the worship of the inward part of the Eucharist can be pronounced unlawful in the Church of England. Such prohibition is supposed to be found in the Articles ; and the supposition, as all men know, has lately received countenance from high authority. It has been ruled that the doctrine contained in this saying, namely, "Worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist under the form of Bread and Wine," is "directly contrary and repugnant to the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles of Religion."

Greatly indeed it were to be wished, for many obvious reasons, that the particular words of the Article, or Articles, to which the document alludes, had been specified, either in the sentence itself, or, if that course would have been informal, in the judgment which preceded it. In default of such specification, one can only surmise that the sentence proceeds either (1.) upon the last clause of Art. XXVIII. ; or (2.) upon some doctrine supposed to be implied in the two Articles taken as a whole.

The last clause of Art. XXVIII. is, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, *or worshipped*." This being the only place in the Articles where Eucharistical Adoration is mentioned, it seems natural to look to it for an explanation of the sentence. Yet many perhaps may feel hesitation in doing so : the premiss will appear to them so palpably

unable to support the conclusion, that they will cast about CHAP. IV. in their mind for some other ground on which the judges must have proceeded.

For what, after all, does this proposition amount to, "The Sacrament was not by Christ's ordinance worshipped?" Take it in its logical form; it is not so much as a censure on the practice. It need not mean more than that the outward adoration was no necessary part of our Lord's institution.

Let us put a case connected with the holy Eucharist. Suppose (since we know that very sad and hurtful controversies have arisen on the point) that some Eastern Council, wishing to allay disputes, had passed a canon in these terms, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance consecrated in leavened bread:" could we justly understand more than this; that whereas a notion had prevailed, and been fiercely maintained, that the leaven was a necessary part of the ordinance, it should not hereafter be insisted on, nor those Christians censured as departing from Christ's institution, who, as in the West, thought it suitable to "put away" the leaven? Would not the clause, so worded, have still left it open to Easterns, continuing to think leaven more agreeable to the institution of Christ, to go on using leaven, and arguing for it as the more dutiful way? There might be many reasons for it, though it were no necessary part of Christ's ordinance; and so, for anything that appears to the contrary in the wording of this clause, there might be powerful reasons for the very adoration of the Eucharist, and an English clergyman might be free to allege those reasons.

§ 17. This argument gains in strength, if we go on to consider the other practices enumerated here to be forbidden along with adoration. They are Reservation, carrying in Procession, and Elevation. As far as the wording of the sentence goes, those three usages are equally forbidden with the worship of the Sacrament, and deprivation would be alike incurred by pleading for or inculcating either one of the four. Yet it is notorious that reservation had been practised from the beginning in the ancient Church, for the

benefit, at least, of the sick and persecuted: Justin Martyr<sup>d</sup> saying, "To those who are not present the consecrated gifts are sent by the deacons;" and Irenæus<sup>e</sup> testifying that in the time of Anicetus, i. e. the middle of the second century, the Eucharist used to be sent as a pledge of Communion from one diocese to another.

Further: reservation had only just ceased to be part of the reformed English Ritual; for until 1552 the Communion of the Sick was thus ordered: On days of public celebration, the priest "shall reserve so much of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood as shall serve the sick person, and as many as shall communicate with him, (if there be any); and so soon, as he conveniently may after the open Communion, shall go to administer the same<sup>f</sup>."

Now we may well understand that there might be abuses and superstitious practices, which might entirely justify the Church, or any portion of it, in suspending or abrogating such an usage; and that, in order to reconcile men's minds to the change, it might be needful to point out that reservation was no part of Christ's institution. But supposing a clergyman to think and argue, on grounds devotional, doctrinal, or practical, that it was our duty to restore the practice; so long as he refrained from holding that it was part of Christ's institution, would any one say that that clergyman was holding doctrine contrary or repugnant to the Article?

Now if this hold in respect of the reservation, why not in respect of the worship also? If Bishop Ridley (e. g.) were now living, and were to write and preach what he maintained almost with his last breath on this subject,—

"We hold with the eyes of faith Him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him that sitteth above, and is worshipped of Angels. We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist; and, if you mean the external Sacrament, I say that also is to be worshipped as a Sacrament<sup>g</sup>;"—

we might demur to his concluding affirmation as likely to be offensive; but since he neither affirms nor implies anything here concerning Christ's ordinance, how could we say

<sup>d</sup> 1 Apol. §. 65.

<sup>f</sup> Two Liturgies, p. 368.

<sup>e</sup> Ep. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 24.

<sup>g</sup> Proceedings, &c. at Bath, p. 94.

with show of reason that he was contradicting this proposition, "The Sacrament was not by Christ's ordinance worshipped?" CHAP. IV.

§ 18. So much would be true, as touching Art. XXVIII., were a person even to maintain the worship of the whole Sacrament, or of the outward part. But now the proposition which has been condemned formally excludes both these from worship, and limits itself to the inward part alone. Thus it runs:

"It is not true that the consecrated Bread and Wine are changed in their natural substances, for they remain in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. It is true that worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, under the form of Bread and Wine<sup>h</sup>."

Be it well noted that this latter phrase is a description of the inward part or thing signified in the Sacrament, as "Bread and Wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received," is of the outward part or sign—"the outward visible sign or form"—with which the inward part is sacramentally connected: that connection being signified, as is usual in language, by the preposition 'under.' Now propositions, to be contrary to one another, must have substantially the same subject and predicate. Is this the case here? The subject of the condemned proposition—(I change the wording for reverence' sake, but the two expressions are meant to be, and I believe are, equivalent; )—the subject, I say, of the condemned proposition is "the inward part or thing signified in the Lord's Supper." What is the subject of the proposition in the Article? "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Can this possibly mean "the inward part or thing signified only?"

The word 'Sacrament,' as every one knows, has a looser and a stricter use. In its stricter use, as defined in the Catechism, it means both the outward and inward parts. In that sense the proposition condemned, limiting itself as it does to the inward part only, cannot contradict the proposition in the Article, for it speaks of a different subject. If

<sup>h</sup> Proceedings, &c. at Bath, p. 226.

CHAP. IV. we take the wider meaning of 'Sacrament,' whereby it is taken for *Sacre rei signum*, any divinely intended sign of something pertaining to God, then the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" must mean the outward part, not the inward—the Bread and Wine, not the Body and Blood of Christ; for These are not the sign, but the thing signified. In neither acceptation, then, can the word Sacrament mean the inward part in the Eucharist exclusively; and yet, unless you give it that meaning, there is plainly no repugnance nor contrariety between the condemned proposition and the proposition in the Article.

That the proposition in the Article refers not to the inward part, was distinctly stated (if the report be correct) by the counsel for the promoters of the late sentence :

"The Article closes with this statement:—'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped,' which shewed the distinction that was made between the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace. They could not reserve the spiritual grace, they could not carry that about, they could not lift it up.—it was of a spiritual nature. Therefore, again he contended that it shewed this Article used the words 'Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' in a sense which confined it to the outward and visible sign, to that which they could see—to that which they could handle<sup>i</sup>."

Is not this expressly maintaining that the worship of the outward part is the only worship forbidden (if it be forbidden) in that Article? and is it not *prima facie* surprising that on such premises a condemnation should have passed, not only on Mr. Denison but on Bishop Andrewes, whose words were declared by a principal person in the court to be a reiteration of what had been said before? those words being, "Christ Himself, the Thing signified of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, is to be worshipped."

As to the predicates of the two propositions—that in the Article, and that which has incurred condemnation—they have been already shewn not to be identical, unless it be the same thing to say that a thing ought to be done, and that it is formally ordained by our Lord.

<sup>i</sup> Proceedings &c. at Bath, p. 70.

§ 19. All things considered, there seems much reason to CHAP. IV.  
fear that the sentence proceeded not so much on the final  
clause of Art. XXVIII. as on a certain construction of that  
and the following Article taken together, making out not only  
Transubstantiation, but any Real Objective Presence to be  
virtually denied in them. This, granting the construction,  
would make the proceeding logical,—a thing too hard for  
human skill, if their sole allegation were the saying in the  
twenty-eighth Article. But what was gained in logic would  
be lost in candour and frankness,—to say nothing just now  
of sound theology.

For the question of the Real Objective Presence was raised  
in the Articles exhibited to the Archbishop at Bath<sup>k</sup>, and that  
doctrine was not treated argumentatively, but assumed to be  
an error, in the pleadings of the promoter's advocate; after-  
wards, the defendant's reply having been heard, the point of  
the Real Presence, and also that of its depending upon con-  
secration, were withdrawn<sup>l</sup>. If, after all this, the convic-  
tion on the matter of adoration went upon the ground that  
the Real Presence after consecration is an error condemned  
by the Articles, it surely ought to have been so declared by  
the court, in Christian and fatherly charity to souls which  
were sure to be perplexed and offended; if not in plain and  
simple justice to persons amenable to the law, and naturally  
anxious to know what their own legal position is.

But now, supposing for a moment—what, under these  
circumstances, can hardly be supposed—that the adoration  
was condemned simply because it was felt to imply the  
Real Presence, still the condemnation professes to ground  
itself on these two Articles; and therefore it seems requisite  
for the completeness of this argument to shew that those  
Articles, taken by themselves, do in no wise negative the  
idea of such a Presence as is alleged. And this may be  
very quickly done.

In the twenty-eighth Article, the first paragraph states  
“that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive  
the same,” i. e. the Sacrament, “the Bread which we break  
is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup

<sup>k</sup> Arts. IX., XII., XIV. <sup>l</sup> Proceedings, &c. at Bath, pp. 69, 70, 72—74, 125.

CHAP. IV. of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." Now take the literal and grammatical meaning of this, (for I presume it will hardly be contended that an accuser may travel out of that meaning, while a defender is so strictly confined to it :) what is there in the saying that "the Bread is a partaking of Christ's Body," inconsistent, literally and grammatically, with the saying that the Body is really present? The first may not warrant the second; but is there any contradiction? Surely, of the two, there is something more like a contradiction in denying the Presence of that which is affirmed to be partaken of.

The Article proceeds to deny Transubstantiation: but to say that this is denying the Real Presence, is just begging the question. Certainly the objections here taken to Transubstantiation do not apply to the notion that the inward and outward parts are both equally present. That notion, taken according to the letter, is proveable from Scripture. It maintains the "nature of a Sacrament," making both parts real. Nor does it appear from history to have been the "occasion of many superstitions."

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." In this all theologians agree; it proves, therefore, nothing against any particular section of them. The words "given" and "taken," as has been often observed, would appear, as far as they go, to imply, rather than disavow, the Objective Presence<sup>1</sup>.

But the sentence in the Article chiefly relied on by those who shrink from the letter of Scripture, is the following: "The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." Yet, on a little consideration, one might perhaps not unreasonably ask, how a person believing the Real Presence of both parts in the Sacrament, could more accurately express his belief in the manner of receiving the inward part, than by adopting this very sentence? The point will be clearer if we supply what there

<sup>1</sup> Compare the letter of Bishop Guest, who penned the Article to Lord Burleigh; ap. Pusey on "The Real Presence," p. 203. "I told him [Bishop Cheney] plainly, that this word

'only' did not exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof."

was no need for the Article to mention—the manner of receiving the outward part. "As the mean whereby the Bread is received and eaten is the mouth, so the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." What shadow of denial of the Real Presence is here?

Besides, we ought to know what the word "faith" means in this sentence. Does it denote the general qualification for worthy receiving,—that "lively faith" which is mentioned in the following Article?—or does not the tenor of the sentence rather lead us to think of a special act of faith in the reality and blessedness of that which is being received? even as it is required of persons to be baptized, to have "Faith whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament." And the corresponding phrases in S. Augustine, so often quoted in this argument, import as much: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent. This, then, is to eat, not that meat which perisheth, but that which remaineth to eternal life. Why make ready the teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten<sup>m</sup>." As if our Lord should say to them, "In that of which I am speaking to you, the eating of that life-giving meat," (which, as it appears afterwards, is the inward part of the Lord's Supper,) "your work, or rather God's work in you, is simply to believe: He will take care of the rest. Bodily eating is for this ordinary Bread; as for the Bread which cometh down from heaven, 'believe, and thou hast eaten.'" In these and the like passages, it is clear that beneficial receiving alone is spoken of, and that the proper instrument by which men so receive is their faith in Him so giving Himself to them. There is not the smallest appearance of S. Augustine's sympathizing with those among the Reformers who regarded the participation of the Redeemer's Body and Blood as ordinarily separable from the grace of the Eucharist, any more than there is any instance in Holy Scripture of such eating and drinking being spoken of except in connection with that Sacrament. And next to Holy Scripture, S. Augustine is plainly the authority most de-

<sup>m</sup> In Joan. Ev. tr. xxv. 12: cf. xxvi. 12.

CHAP. IV. ferred to in the Articles on this subject. We are not, therefore, likely to be far wrong if we take the twenty-eighth Article as insisting, not on faith in general, but on faith in the particular grace of the Sacrament. "Believe that thou receivest Him," (so we seem to be told,) "and thou hast Him"."

Concerning the twenty-ninth Article: the safest way is to understand it as interpreting S. John in the same sense as S. Augustine does, whom it quotes\*. But if we look it, as the Judgment does, to deny all eating, in any sense, of the Holiest Thing by the wicked and unworthy, not even so could it be inferred that the framers of that Article shrank from the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence in respect of the good and faithful; nor does the Article, so understood, contradict the notion which has commended itself to some, that there is at first a Real Presence to all, but that it is withdrawn when the unbeliever communicates.

Are we not, on the whole, justified in inferring that the Real Objective Presence is not impugned by the general tenor of these two Articles? Therefore, neither is adoration impugned as implying the Real Objective Presence.

§ 20. The question then comes back upon us, What *could* have been the Censors' ground for saying that it is impugned? May it be pardonable, if one venture to suggest that even good and sensible men, giving way to a panic, are not likely to be good reasoners; that something like this happened to the authors of this sentence; that they hastily caught up, as people do in a panic, that which in fact is a weapon from the Roman armoury, viz. that the Article does in such sense deny any reception by the wicked, as virtually to deny the Real Objective Presence also; and then knowing that adoration at least of the heart is inseparable from belief in such Presence, they considered it as condemned by the two Articles taken together? Whether this, however, or any other, was the process by which they arrived at their conclusion, it is impossible not to feel deep regret that it was not distinctly stated, according to the ordinary practice

\* Cf. S. Mark xi. 24.

• What that sense is, Dr. Pusey and Mr. Grueber have shewn.

of ecclesiastical as well as civil courts in this country, more CHAP. IV.  
especially in cases involving heavy penalties. And in this case, the court being eminently, by its composition, a court Christian, it would not perhaps have been irrelevant or unfatherly, had some words been spoken to relieve the consciences of the many, who have hitherto practised unquestioning adoration, without a thought of being undutiful to the Church; and to protect them from the troublesome scruples and bewildering imaginations, doctrinal, metaphysical, or ecclesiastical, which the bare authoritative utterance of such a sentence would be likely to awaken in them; and that at a time when their hearts most earnestly long to surrender themselves to their Saviour without reserve or interruption.

§ 21. Or, it may be, the condemnation was meant to apply not so much to the requirement of worship, as to the phrase by which the Object of worship had been defined,—“the Body and Blood of Christ *under the form of Bread and Wine.*” But if so, then, according to a rule which has entered largely into this very judgment, it was specially incumbent upon the censors to make known the grounds of their censure. In denying the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ to be eaten by the wicked, they have laid great stress—indeed, the main stress of their cause—on the *title* of Art. XXIX. They have refused, it would appear, to consider the explanation which has been offered, and sustained by a large array of authorities, to the effect that the phrase, “eat Christ’s Body,” is a theological phrase capable of more than one interpretation; that is, that it has more than one “literal and grammatical sense,” and that the body of the Article itself fixes the title to that meaning which would justify the defendant. All this they entirely ignored, and grounded a sentence of deprivation on a statement, of which all that could be fairly said was, that it was contrary to one of two literal and grammatical interpretations of one single phrase. By this, at any rate, they would seem to bind themselves to be very “literal and grammatical” in all their proceedings, and not to condemn the other expression, “present under the form of Bread and Wine,” (which is, in other words, “really and objectively present, as the inward part of the Sacrament,”) unless they could

CHAP. IV. shew some "literal and grammatical" contradiction of it in the Articles. I do not see how this can be denied, without maintaining one rule for the prosecution and another for the defence. No such contradiction has yet been distinctly alleged. If any exist, the learned assessors will be only doing themselves justice in pointing it out.

§ 22. And more than this. There is among the Thirty-nine Articles one which was originally specified in the charge against Archdeacon Denison, but the mention of it was afterwards, for whatever reason, withdrawn; I mean the thirty-fifth, which re-asserts the general doctrine of the Book of Homilies. Now the condemned phrase ("under the form of Bread and Wine") is taken, as every one knows, from the Book of Homilies; not, indeed, from the body of any homily, but from one of two authorized titles of the fifteenth homily of the second book,—authorized, undoubtedly, one as much as the other; and therefore, according to all common rules of construction, the second to be taken as at least reconcilable with the first;—which notion is further confirmed by the description prefixed to the body of Queen Elizabeth's Homilies: "The second part of Homilies, on such matters as were promised *and entituled* in the former part of Homilies."

And on comparing the two titles, few persons, I think, would doubt that the one was meant to be equivalent to the other. The first is "the due receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of Bread and Wine;" the second, "the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." "The Body and Blood of Christ under the form of Bread and Wine" is thus set before us as something inseparable from "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,"—as, indeed, it must be, according to the account of a sacrament in the Catechism.

And surely this—being part of the definition of the Eucharist—is a main point of Christian doctrine. If it be so wrong, so ungodly and unwholesome, as this condemnation supposes it, how can it be true that the Homilies, taken generally, "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine?"

One way, indeed, is conceivable, in which we might be forced to admit the hypothesis of the phrase having been

left by mistake; i. e. if the homily so entitled contained any statement clearly repugnant to the first title. But no such statement ever has, or can be, produced from this or any other homily. CHAP. IV.

No doubt the formula, "Sub specie Panis et Vini," is used by the Roman Catholics; but it is also used by the Lutherans, and from them, probably, it was adopted by Ridley, whose sentiments on Christ's Presence in the Eucharist are known to have differed materially from Calvin's. They were formed, confessedly, on "The Book of Bertram the Priest," who describes the holy Sacrament thus: "Sub velamento corporei Panis, corporeique Vini, spirituale Corpus, spiritualisque Sanguis existit<sup>o</sup>." "Sub velamento:" the phrase is equivalent to "*under the form.*" That Bertram meant by it to express a spiritual, not a carnal or material, Presence, is plain by his saying, "Panis ille vinumque *figurate* Christi Corpus et Sanguis existit<sup>o</sup>;" and, "Secundum visibilem creaturam corpus pascunt, juxta vero potentioris virtutem substantiæ mentes fidelium et pascunt et sanctificant." That he did not receive Transubstantiation is also plain; for his words are, "Secundum creaturarum substantiam, quod fuerunt ante consecrationem, hoc et postea consistunt." Bertram, therefore, holding Christ's presence under the form of Bread and Wine, did yet contradict the same two errors which the Reformed Church of England warns her children against.

And however coarsely Luther himself, and some of the Lutherans, might sometimes express themselves, there can be no reasonable doubt that the very same is the true meaning of the Confession of Augsburg, teaching (Art. X.) that "with the Bread and Wine, the Body and Blood are truly present in the Lord's Supper, and truly given to those who eat there; and they censure such as teach otherwise."

Neither Ridley, then, nor the Homilies, nor such as adopt their language, can fairly be charged with holding the gross, carnal idea which was afterwards imputed to them under the name of Consubstantiation: which idea seems to be censured by implication in our twenty-eighth Article, where the Body of Christ is said to be "given, taken, and received in the

<sup>o</sup> Book of Bertram, p. 24, ed. 1686.

CHAP. IV. Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner ;” and at the end of the Liturgy, where we disclaim adoration of any corporal Presence of Christ. Well may we, with the whole Church rightly understood, condemn and disavow any notion of such a Presence. But to condemn the phrase, “under the form of Bread and Wine,” would be condemning, first, Bishop Ridley, and the rest who sanctioned the First Book of Homilies, and, through them, the Confession of Augsburg, and the whole body of orthodox Lutherans.

Not in this present instance only has mischief been done by a vague dread of Consubstantiation, hurrying people on to erroneous censures, which would have been spared, had they given themselves more time to consider either the true meaning of the words censured, or the extent to which the censure would reach.

§ 23. Thus, in default of all explanation from those who decided the other day that Eucharistical worship is contrary to the Articles, endeavour has been made to trace, as exactly as one might by conjecture, the possible ground of that decision, and to shew that it is as little warranted by the Prayer-book, Articles, and Homilies, as by Holy Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. The survey, such as it is, will perhaps have sufficiently explained the deep and intense anxiety which was felt by many, at the first promulgation of the sentence, for the integrity of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,—an anxiety which must continue to be felt, until it shall please God to put in the hearts of those who have spiritual authority, either to withdraw that condemnation, or so to limit it that it shall not seem to contradict the Real Objective Presence.

For assuredly it is not, as it now stands, a mere question of posture. Were that all, there is not one who denies the full right of every particular or national Church to choose among the several postures of adoration, and to forbid the use of either or all of them on this or that particular occasion, when it might cause scandal or confusion; just as English Churchmen are left, as it seems, to their own charity and discretion, whether or no to recognise by outward gesture the Presence which they must believe (unless

they deny altogether the validity of the Roman Sacraments) CHAP. V.  
when they meet with any of the customary solemn processions, or on other occasions not unfamiliar to travellers.

The question, it must be repeated, is not "*how or when* we are to adore," but "*whether it is lawful at all to adore Christ as the inward part of the Sacrament?*" That this is the real issue we were officially told by the Archbishop's principal lay assessor, when he pronounced a certain sentence quoted from Bishop Andrewes to be a "reiteration" of what had been condemned before: and neither his Grace himself, nor any of his clerical assessors, did either then or at any time since intimate any dissent from the statement.

It stands therefore at present before the world as the judicial sentence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that it is contrary to the Articles to say, "Christ Himself, the Thing signified of the Sacrament, is to be worshipped in and with the Sacrament," and that any beneficed person so teaching and worshipping must incur deprivation. Now of course no one supposes that the Archbishop and the clergy sitting with him would deny that Christ is to be worshipped, and with special worship where He is especially present. It remains, therefore, that they mean to deny any such especial Presence in the Eucharist as should claim special worship and homage; and what is that but denying altogether any Real Presence after consecration? Consequently, believers in that Presence—not only in its truth, but in its essential importance—must apprehend a vital doctrine of the Gospel to be put in jeopardy by this decision. It is a sad thing to say, but is it not too true?

## CHAPTER V.

### DUTIES OF CHURCHMEN IN RESPECT OF THIS CASE.

§ 1. THERE remains the very serious practical inquiry, how the position of persons so believing within the Church of England is affected by these proceedings. And this again is two questions in one; for it may be taken as relating either to our legal or to our moral and spiritual position.

CHAP. V. With regard to the former, it is useless to speculate much, it being in a way to receive solution from the proper authorities in due course of law. Meantime we may thankfully receive the assurance, that for the present the judgment would only form a precedent for the one diocese of Bath and Wells, and there only in regard of benefices in the Bishop's patronage. Again, we may entertain the hope that it may be reversed on appeal, or fall to the ground by reason of some providential flaw. If neither of these things happen, then (as the judgment on appeal will be legally binding at least on the diocesan courts of England,) the other question will arise, how shall we stand, morally and spiritually, as clergymen bound by certain Articles, when the legal interpreters of those Articles have declared them to be, by implication, contrary and repugnant to a tenet which we hold as a vital doctrine of the Gospel?

§ 2. But before going on to this, it may be worth while to say one word more on the comparatively immaterial question of our legal position. Speaking under correction, I believe that, as a matter of course, until the legislature decree otherwise, the decision of the highest court of appeal rules all subsequent decisions. Therefore every clergyman from that day forward will understand, that if he be known in any way to hold the duty of worshipping Christ especially present in Holy Communion, his place and benefice in the Church of England will be at the mercy of any one choosing to exhibit articles against him. And since it is known that there is a numerous and powerful, and in these matters (may we not say it?) an *unscrupulous* section of the Church, watching to see whom they may take at such an advantage; there can be small doubt, humanly speaking, what will become in a few generations, not only of the custom of adoration, but of the doctrine inseparable from it—the doctrine of the Real Presence among us.

Again, it is doubtless true that legally the act of Elizabeth, under which the judgment has been obtained, would not, taken by itself, constitute the Articles the sole test of doctrine. But those who have expressed a fear of such a result were thinking not of that act only, but of its effect

taken conjointly with the Gorham decision. The latter seemed to rule that nothing should be held obligatory, unless it were affirmed in the Articles. The former, that nothing, however plainly affirmed in Holy Scripture, or the Prayer-book, should be so much as allowed, if it appeared at first sight contrary to the Articles; assuming thereby that that one document had nothing in it ambiguous, nothing equivocal, nothing which could need to be interpreted by comparison with other documents of co-ordinate authority. What more could be desired by any one who might wish to escape from Holy Scripture and the Prayer-book, and make the Thirty-nine Articles our sole standard? If a man were minded, for instance, to deny the Inspiration of Scripture, the Eternity of hell-torments, or the personal existence of the Evil Spirit, he would have only to point out that they are not affirmed in the Articles. If he wished to deny S. James's doctrine of Justification by works, or to enforce Calvin's doctrine of absolute Predestination, he might have his way by quoting the *letter* of the eleventh and seventeenth Articles.

If it be really the mind of the present English Church so extensively to narrow her pale of admissible doctrine on one side, and enlarge it on the other; would it not be wiser, better, more seemly, to do it once for all, deliberately, and in the face of day, that all men might know what themselves and others are about, rather than go on in this unhappy, vexatious course; watching for seasons when an adversary happens to be unwary or unpopular, or when sympathy may be hoped for from a prime minister or judge; and disposing of deep and high points of theology by a side-wind, *et quasi aliud agendo*? Ἐν δὲ φαεὶ καὶ ὀλεσσοῖ, ἔπει νύ τοι εὔαδεν οὕτως.

§ 3. But be that as it may, the question will remain for individuals, supposing the sentence confirmed, What ought they to do, who have gone on hitherto believing the Real Presence, and adoring accordingly, in no undutifulness to the English Church, but in full conviction that they were but carrying out what they had learned in the Catechism and Communion Office? They cannot give up their con-

## CHAP. V.

victions, they cannot cease to believe and adore in deference to a mere affirmation, even from the highest human authority, the reasons (for whatever cause) being withheld; nor yet upon such reasons as have hitherto been alleged. Neither is the matter an abstract one, such as one may withdraw his mind from, and exclude it from his teaching, or even in a way suspend his belief of it, in a dutiful wish to obey those whom God's providence has set over him. Such cases are conceivable; perhaps (e. g.) a person's view of predestination may admit of being so treated; but whether or no Jesus Christ the Son of Man is specially present in the Holy Sacrament, and whether to worship Him accordingly or no—these are thoughts which cannot be put by; they come before the mind and heart as often as you go to His altar. And if you believe them to be essential parts of Christian truth and duty, you must teach them to all entrusted to your care.

The only question will be, Is a person continuing so to believe and teach bound to resign any privileges which he may enjoy in virtue of his subscription to the Articles? or is he free in conscience to retain them as long as he can, if he consider it otherwise his duty to do so?

Now this question seems to resolve itself into another and a more general inquiry. It being allowed that human laws bind the conscience of the subject to obey them according to the intention of the legislature, if not contrary to the law of God; we are to consider whether the like submission is absolutely due to *the judicial interpretations* of the same laws? For example: certain goods of foreign manufacture are, or were lately, prohibited in this country, and no doubt it was a moral duty to abstain from importing what were unquestionably known to be goods of that description; but let us suppose that in a particular instance a question had arisen, whether such and such a fabric came under that description, and the judges had determined it in the affirmative, while the merchant, from his technical knowledge, was thoroughly convinced of the negative; was he bound in conscience to abstain from importing the like in time to come? or might he innocently risk the transaction if he thought it worth

while? Other imaginary cases might be put, but this one CHAP. V. will be sufficient to explain what is meant.

Now, as I can hardly conceive any one imagining that the tradesman in this instance was morally guilty of breaking the law, so neither, or rather much less, would the same guilt seem to attach to a clergyman, retaining his cure, if he could, after his opinions and teaching had been condemned, supposing him sincerely and seriously convinced before God that the condemnation proceeded on a mistake in the law. It would be a question, not of right or wrong, but of expedient or inexpedient; and surely, in the event we are now contemplating, (may God avert it! but if it *should* happen,) truth and charity, and loyalty and devotion, the honour of God Incarnate, and the salvation of the souls of our brethren—all the motives that can be imagined going to make up the highest expediency—would render it the duty of every Catholic clergyman to abide in his place until he was forcibly expelled from it, either by a like prosecution, ending in like manner, or from inability to bear up against the worry and expense of the proceeding.

If any misgiving occurred to a right-minded person in adopting this course, it would probably be on the ground that there was some appearance of breach of trust, in respect of those under whose authority he was taking the benefit of his subscription, conscious all the while that he was subscribing in a different sense from what they might be willing to allow. But this scruple might at once be met, by taking care to give sufficient notice of your mind and purpose to the persons concerned, and so enabling them, if they thought proper, to put you also on your trial<sup>p</sup>.

§ 4. So much may suffice with respect to our *legal* difficulties: but there are others more serious, connected with our *ecclesiastical* position. We know too well, by very sad experience, that some earnest persons regard the Church of England as distinctly committed by the sentences of that which may happen practically at a given time to be her supreme Court of Appeal. So that if the present judgment against adoration (e.g.) were unhappily affirmed by her Majesty in

<sup>p</sup> See note at the conclusion.

СНАР. V. Council, there is, according to them, no help for it: the Church by law established has denied the faith, and believers must seek another home where they may.

Now many will feel as if this saying refuted itself by its very extravagance. To suppose that for one sentence, once promulgated and enacted, by a court constituted as that of which we are speaking, every one's faith and practice remaining just what it was before, by far the greater number of our communicants knowing nothing at all of the matter, not even aware that there was any trial going on, and ready, for aught any one can tell, to disclaim the doctrine implied in the sentence, if it were duly explained to them, from the very bottom of their hearts;—to suppose, I say, that by one such decision all these believing multitudes were fairly turned out of God's Church on earth, and left with the heathen to the forlorn hope of incurable ignorance,—all this would be intolerable, nay, impossible, unless some unquestionable word of some infallible authority were shewn for it. Compare it with the known dealings of the Almighty towards either Churches or individuals. See how it looks when judged of by the analogy of the faith. No doubt there are fearful instances of one person falling in a moment, and drawing after him in ruin thousands, themselves at the time unconscious, or not yet existing. We do not forget Adam in Paradise, nor Esau selling his own and his children's birthright, nor Saul when Samuel turned away from him, nor Jeroboam when he made Israel to sin; nor the several ringleaders of heresy and schism among Christians, and how their unhappy followers were cast out with them; nor (in a word) how the fathers' sins are by the Divine law visited on the children: and it is, of course, possible that any particular instance of transgression and misleading may prove to be one more in that list; but who at the time shall declare it so? Surely none may do that with authority but the Judge Himself; and when He has done so, He has constantly done it by signs unequivocal—miracles or prophecies, or the consenting voice of His Church; and even then not until after long endurance and repeated warnings. But for private Christians to take upon themselves to pass that sentence,—which a man

would in effect be passing, if he forsook the Church's communion for any such proceeding as is now dreaded,—this would seem not unlike the error of those who were warned that they knew not what manner of spirit they were of. One mortal sin, we know, deliberately consented to, is enough to destroy a soul; but we know also how long and how tenderly He whose name is Merciful as well as Jealous has borne with whole years of transgression and has not destroyed; we know that His mercy is over all His works; that it extends to the thousandth generation, while He is said to visit iniquity upon children only and children's children. The antecedent probability therefore is, in every case, until the Church has examined and ruled it, that the error complained of, however real and deadly in itself, does not bring such a taint of heresy over those communicating with its professors, as to separate them, *ipso facto*, from the Church.

§ 5. Secondly, in this particular case, the error coming out not in the shape of a synodical or legislative enactment, but of a judicial decision; as it is no part of the law of the land, of force to bind the conscience of the subjects, so is it no part of the law of the Church, (the provincial Church, of course, I mean,) with power to bind the conscience of its members. It betrays, indeed, a sad want of discipline, and threatens and forebodes an eventual corruption of doctrine; but it leaves the formularies of the Church and the faith of its present members just where they were. If any one doubt this, let him consider one or two parallel cases. Suppose, from some epidemical delusion, (we have seen such things at no great distance,) it had become morally impossible to obtain a verdict of guilty against a murderer in a particular country—would any one think of laying it to the charge of that country that it had no law against murder? Or what if, at any time, by connivance, corruption, or indolence, it should appear that the slave-trade is still being carried on in English vessels, or slavery practised in some English colony—would it be fair to say that slavery and the slave-trade had again become part of the laws and institutions of England? Or again,—to put a case nearer the actual one,—if we imagine the days of Arian ascendancy returned, and, by

CHAP. V. some such combination as we read of under Constantius, a judicial body formed which had a leaning that way, and skill more or less to carry with it the popular feeling, and thus a sentence obtained against orthodoxy: would such a decision, or a hundred such, prove the English Church to be in its essence really Arian? They would certainly cause great anxiety lest it should quickly become such; but instead of their affording any excuse or reason for separation, every heart that was truly loyal to our Saviour would assuredly feel called on to cling to its profession the more earnestly, and take away the reproach from Israel; and if any made that state of things an argument for withdrawing himself and joining some other Christian body, how very sure should we feel that he was either indulging temper, or but availing himself of it as a plea for carrying into effect what for other reasons he had before determined on!

The matter may be put in this light. Casuists are agreed that the proper authorities to determine the meaning of documents subscribed to, are the same by whom the subscription is enforced; i. e., in this case, the Church and State of England. There can be no reasonable doubt that when these bodies last legislated on the subject, in 1661, they meant to receive subscriptions in the sense now condemned. If they have changed their mind and will, let them declare it in the only way in which it is competent for them to do so; namely, by fresh legislation corrective of the former. Until they shall have so done, they must be taken to be of the same mind as before, and the old interpretation to stand good. Any court of justice interpreting the document on any other principle narrower than this, must be presumed to be mistaken, and cannot bind the conscience by its decision. Nothing can do that, short of the voice of the legislature, distinctly enacting the new interpretation. The synod or convocation so decreeing may bind us as Churchmen; the parliament as Englishmen; until they have spoken we are free.

§ 6. It would appear, then, that by the decision, simply *as a decision*, we really need not feel ourselves or our Church in any degree bound or committed. It may be a great

scandal and a bad precedent, but no man is pledged as a Churchman or as a clergyman to abide by it, and therefore no man need think of retiring on account of it. But there is one circumstance connected with it which yet requires grave consideration; it presents, indeed, as far as I see, the only real difficulty of the case, in the view of a conscientious Churchman, knowing and wishing to hold by the rules of antiquity. That circumstance is the share which the Metropolitan has had, and is likely to have, in the whole transaction; and the difficulty which it raises is incurred already: we have not to wait for it until the appeal shall have been dealt with: we have been burdened with it ever since the first solemn declaration of the Court at Bath. It is simply this: that if there be any soundness in the statements and arguments set down above, the proposition of the Court touching worship in Holy Communion would seem, even by the existing law of the English Church, to be heretical, or verging on heresy; and of course the question might occur, Can Christians knowingly go on in communion with a spiritual superior who has publicly so committed himself, and not be partakers of the ill? This question I should answer, without hesitation, in the affirmative, and that for reasons strictly ecclesiastical. I will endeavour to explain, as briefly and clearly as I can, the grounds both of the difficulty and of the solution.

For the *primâ facie* suspicion of heresy: the measure and extent of that evil, as is well known, are legally determined among us by the statute, 1 Eliz. i. 56, where it is ruled that persons commissioned by the Crown to determine ecclesiastical causes “shall not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general Councils, or any of them, or by any other general Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy by the high court of parliament of this realm, with the assent of the

CHAP. V. clergy in their convocation ;” and “ it hath been since generally holden, that although the high commission court was abolished by the statute 16 Chas. I. c. 11, yet those rules will be good directions to ecclesiastical courts in relation to heresy<sup>p</sup>. ”

Now the third Œcumenical Council, that of Ephesus, A.D. 431, gives the full authority of the Church to the following paragraph of the remonstrance sent to Nestorius a little before by S. Cyril and the Synod of Alexandria<sup>q</sup>.

“ And there is another point which we must of necessity add ; how that, setting forth the death after the flesh of the Only-begotten Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ, and confessing His resurrection from the dead, and ascension into the heavens, we celebrate in the Churches the unbloody Sacrifice. And thus we draw nigh to the mystical Eucharists, and are sanctified by becoming partakers of the holy Flesh and the precious Blood of Christ the Saviour of us all. And not as common Flesh do we receive it, (God forbid ! ) nor yet as that of a Man sanctified, and united unto the Word as having one and the same dignity, or as having received God to dwell in Him, but as truly life-giving, and the very Flesh of the Word Himself. For being, as God, in His nature, Life, in that He became One with His own Flesh, He manifested it to be life-giving. So that, although He say to us, ‘ Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of *the Son of Man*, and drink His Blood,’—we are not to infer that it (like the rest) is the flesh of a man, one of those who are such as we are ; (for how shall the flesh of a man be life-giving, according to its own nature ? ) but that it has truly become the very own Flesh of Him who for our sake both became and is entitled as well a Son as a Man.”

Here it is plain, first, that the Council, adopting the phraseology of the Liturgy then in use at Alexandria, gives distinct sanction to the doctrine contained in that and all the ancient Liturgies, of the unbloody Sacrifice offered in all Churches continually. Next, that it attributes our participation of Christ’s Body and Blood, and our consequent sanctification, not to the whole action, including the prayers and the rest, but to that which we do when we draw nigh to that which

<sup>p</sup> Burn’s Eccl. Law, ii. 277. 5th ed.

<sup>q</sup> § vii. ap. Routh, Opusc. ii. 25.

has been sacramentally blessed, and partake of it. Thirdly, CHAP. V. that what we so draw nigh to receive and to partake of is not "common flesh," (God forbid!) but the "very own Flesh of the Word, Who, as God, being by nature Life, because He had made Himself one with His own Flesh, declared it to be life-giving." It is for those who deny the Real Presence, and forbid adoration, to reconcile these sayings, if they can, with their own views; or else to shew some reason why they are not to be accounted so far heretical, according to the standard of heresy in the Church of England.

§ 7. Consider, again, in connection with the foregoing, what follows, and observe how it is sanctioned; it is not a statement made incidentally with a view to establish something else, but was regarded by the Œcumenical Council as so necessary a portion of our holy faith, that they guarded it with a special anathema<sup>r</sup>: "If any one confess not the Flesh of the Lord to be life-giving, and the very own Flesh of the Word Himself who is of God the Father, but [regard it] as belonging to some other beside Him, however closely knit unto Him in dignity,—i. e. as having simply received an indwelling of the Deity, and not rather as life-giving, (to repeat the expression,) because it hath become the very own Flesh of the Word who hath power to quicken all things," (or "to make all His living progeny<sup>s</sup>,")—"let him be anathema."

Observe that the life-giving quality is declared to depend on Its being "the very Flesh of the Word who hath power to quicken all things;" which implies that It is life to us not simply by Its merit as a Sacrifice on the Cross, but also by a real participation of It on our part. That Flesh, the Council means, which we approach and partake of in the Eucharist: no one, if he fairly compare the two passages, can avoid seeing this. Or if there were any doubt, it would be settled by the use of the same phrase, "the mystic Eucharist," in the following dictate of S. Cyril: "I hear that some affirm that the mystical Eucharist avails not for sanctification, if any relic of it remain unto another day. But in so saying they

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. § xi. p. 32.

<sup>s</sup> ζαογονεῖν.

<sup>t</sup> Ep. ad Calosyrium, Op. t. vii. 365 B. ed. Aubert.: cf. Cosin's Works, v. 130.

ГЛАВ. V. are beside themselves. For Christ is not estranged [therefrom], neither will His holy Body admit alteration. But the power of the blessing, and the life-giving grace, do therein continue." The particular idea denoted by that word "objective" could scarce be set forth more distinctly. Can we help recognising it, when the same phrase, "mystic Eucharist," is employed by the council itself, over which the same S. Cyril was presiding, and in a document of which it is impossible to doubt that he was himself the author? And this document has been in such sort adopted by the Church of England, as that any contradiction of it is enacted to be positive heresy.

§ 8. Nor may it be omitted that the first Nicene Council so far encourages the same notion, as not only to call the holy Eucharist in three several canons a Gift and an Offering, but also to imply that the giving and receiving of it is giving and receiving the Body of Christ<sup>u</sup>. In the fifth canon they say, (and surely it is an enactment not unseasonable to be brought just now to our recollection,)—"At the provincial synod twice in the year inquire into the causes of the excommunicate, lest some narrowness of mind or party-spirit, or other uncomfortable feeling, should have caused the exclusion; and let one of the synods be holden before Lent, that all such ill-temper being done away, the *Gift* may be *offered* pure unto God." In the eleventh, certain penitents are directed, without *offering*, to communicate in the prayers only. The eighteenth runs thus: "It hath come before the holy and great synod, that in some places and cities the deacons give the Eucharist to the presbyters, a thing transmitted to us neither by canon nor custom, that such as have no authority to *offer*, should give to those who *offer the Body of Christ*. And of this, too, we have been informed, that certain of the deacons approach the Eucharist even before the Bishops. Wherefore, let all this be done away. . . . Let them receive the Eucharist in their own order, after the presbyters, at the hands either of the Bishop or the presbyter." Here is a distinct recognition of the Eucharist, as a sacrifice in which the Body of Christ is offered by Bishops

<sup>u</sup> Ap. Routh, Script. Eccl. i. 373, 377, 381.

and presbyters, and cannot be offered, in the same sense, by CHAP. V.  
deacons and laymen.

§ 9. No one who really reflects upon these sayings of the great councils, and is at all aware of the mass of undesigned testimony, diffusing itself through all antiquity, to the same effect, can doubt what sort of a decree would have been passed at Nicæa or Ephesus, had the doctrine of the Eucharist required synodical assertion in those days. But whether it be that the sacramental system does not require to be doctrinally known in order that its benefits may be received, any more than a person need be able to analyze what he eats and drinks before he can have it for "food and gladness," or for other causes unknown to us; it pleased Providence that the Church should enter on its era of sad division without any œcumenical decision primarily and directly pronounced on that subject. And therefore that portion of Christ's truth has not come down to us in distinct dogmatical assertions guarded by anathemas, as the statements concerning the Trinity and Incarnation have. And it is consequently a more adventurous thing, and more largely partaking of the boldness of private judgment, to denounce any person as a heretic in respect of the former class of errors. It is not so plainly our duty to withdraw from his communion, as it would be if he had been distinctly excommunicated by the Church. Materially he may be in heresy, but formally he is not yet so,—a distinction acknowledged by all theologians\*. "Simple error is not heresy, without the addition, 1. of something in the *matter* of it, viz. that it take place in somewhat appertaining to the faith; and, 2. of something in the erring *person*, i. e. pertinacity, which alone makes a heretic. And this pertinacity arises from pride; for it cometh of great pride, when a man prefers his own sense to the Truth Divinely revealed." And S. Augustine says, "Though men's opinion be false and perverse, yet if they maintain it not with any obstinate wilfulness; and especially if it be one which they have not daringly and presumptuously engendered for themselves, but have received it of parents misled and fallen into error; and if with

\* S. Tho. Aquin. De Malo. qu. viii. Art. i. ad 7<sup>mum</sup>. t. xv. 165. ed. Venet. 1781.

CHAP. V. careful anxiety they are seeking the truth, and are ready, as soon as they have found it, to receive correction; such are by no means to be accounted among heretics<sup>y</sup>.” “Because” (as Aquinas, quoting the passage, adds) “they have no choice, *αἴρεσις*,—no set purpose,—of contradicting the doctrine of the Church. In this way,” (he proceeds to say,) “certain doctors appear to have differed, even in some things appertaining to the faith, which had not yet been determined by the Church. But after they had been determined by the authority of the universal Church, if any one kept obstinately resisting such an ordinance, he would be accounted a heretic<sup>z</sup>.”

In the case before us, the determination of the whole Church is so far less unequivocal than it might be, in that it has never been sealed with an anathema by an Œcumenical Council. Nor is there any proof of its having been so distinctly set before those who have denied it, that they can be rightly and at once accused of heretical pravity in resisting it. And even if they might, that were no excuse for separating from the hundreds of thousands of simple Christians who go on believing our Catechism and partaking of our Eucharist, with or without any definite perception of the doctrine of the Sacraments, vital though it be. “For” (to quote again the same author<sup>a</sup>) “the simple are not condemned as heretics for not knowing the Articles of the faith, but because they *obstinately maintain* things contrary to those Articles; which they would not do, if they had not their faith corrupted by heresy.”

In sum: heretical as this or any similar decision may appear to a well-instructed private Christian, it cannot, under existing circumstances, so taint with heresy those who pronounce or favour it, as to render it his duty to break communion with them, and with all, sound or unsound in faith, who abide in the same body with them. It might and would be his duty, had they been pronounced heretics by sufficient authority; but such is not now the case. For example: were there now a Bossuet in the French Church, he might

<sup>y</sup> Ep. xliii. l. t. ii. p. 67. ed. Bened. t. xxii. 55.  
Antwerp, 1700.

<sup>a</sup> In 3 Sent. dist. 25. qu. 2. t. xi.

<sup>z</sup> Sec. Secundæ, qu. xi. art. ii. ad 3. 349.

perchance upon good grounds entertain the fullest conviction that the recent decree touching the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin does in fact promulgate a material heresy, and that a true Ecumenical Council, were such an one ever to meet and decide upon that doctrine, would assuredly condemn it with an anathema. But it does not follow that a person so convinced ought to withdraw himself from the present Roman Catholic Communion. It might be his duty to make such a profession of his faith as would probably involve him in serious ecclesiastical penalties. But excommunication or deprivation incurred for conscience' sake is one thing, voluntary separation is quite another thing. The application to our own case is evident.

There are, indeed, instances in Church history of private persons, lay or clerical, refusing to communicate with heresiarchs; as Eusebius of Dorylæum, and others separating themselves from Nestorius, in the beginning of the movement which led to the Council of Ephesus: but they did not thereby break communion with the mass of believers at Constantinople; and it seems not to have been so much from an apprehension of contracting the heretical taint from him, as because such separation was the received mode in that time of bringing such questions to a legitimate issue: as if one should say, "Either he must be excommunicated or I." It is no longer so, now that the holy discipline is so generally, alas! in abeyance.

§ 10. But is there, then, no remedy? nothing for clergymen or faithful laymen to do, who may feel with the whole Church for so many ages, that he who touches the doctrine of the Real Presence after consecration, touches—to use sacred words—the very "apple of their eye"—whether it be by prohibition of worship or in any other way? Yes, surely; they have first and chiefly hearts to lift up night and day in prayer to the Most Holy Trinity, and they have the commemorative Sacrifice of their Lord, in union with which to present their intercessions. As towards men they have tongues and pens, wherewith to protest and appeal; they have influence with more or fewer of their brethren; they have more or less substance, of which they may give to such

as are suffering in any way for the same truth, (of whom not a few may be found, if they are well looked after). And in the present instance there is something yet more to be done, by all subscribers to the Articles at least; their protests and appeals need not be mere words, as on other occasions the like may have appeared; they may be so worded, and so publicly notified, as to make them liable to the same molestations and penalties which others for the same teaching have incurred<sup>b</sup>. Such sayings are real doings, and if God give them grace to utter them not rashly or in the way of challenge, but in the serious discharge of a painful duty, they may be blessed, if trouble ensue, with somewhat of the peculiar blessing of Christ's confessors.

§ 11. One word more to point out why the way of Appeal as well as Protest is recommended. Protest, strictly speaking—i. e. a mere 'solemn declaration against a thing'—appears to be the course of those who feel themselves aggrieved, but know of no legal remedy. But to appeal, taken also strictly, is to apply to another, a superior judge; it assumes that there is a grievance, but supposes also a constitutional corrective. A protest, as such, simply relieves the mind and conscience of those who take part in it; an appeal adds to this a call upon certain others who are supposed to have power to redress the wrong.

A protest in any juridical matter supposes the final authority to have spoken; an appeal, of course, supposes the contrary.

For which reason, among others, it seems matter of regret that the term *protestant* rather than *appellant* was adopted by those who, not intending schism, were cut off from the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century; especially as the former term arose from the mere political accident of their representatives forming the minority in the Diet of Spire, 1529, whereas the latter would have kept in mind Luther's appeal long before to a general council: a much more legitimate and ecclesiastical ground to stand on, were it only that by simply protesting we do in some sense admit the paramount authority of Rome, by appealing we assert Rome herself to be under authority.

<sup>b</sup> See note at the end of the book.

However, in our own position—I mean, the position of English Churchmen—it seems to be of the very last importance that we should keep in our own minds, and before all Christendom, the fact that we stand as orthodox Catholics upon a constant virtual appeal to the œcumenical voice of the Church, expressed by the four great Councils, and by general consent in all the ages during which she continued undivided. And if that voice be disputed, is there any conceivable way of bringing the dispute to an issue, except only another true Œcumenical Council, when such by God's grace may be had? In the meantime, what can we do but continue as we are in those points of our creed which other portions of the Church dispute, (unless we can be proved to be wrong :) not denying *their* life and catholicity, but maintaining our own, with submission to the whole Church? The position may be called unreal or chimerical, but it is that which has been claimed for the Church of England by two great men (to mention no more) whose names may as fairly as any be taken to represent the great schools or sections in this Church: Cranmer, when drawing towards his martyrdom, and Bramhall in his exile, expressly asserting not simply the truth, but the Catholicity of the English Church. And they were not either of them persons apt to take up with a chimerical, unreal view.

Nay, the question may be well asked—much more easily asked than answered—whether, in the present divided state of Christendom, all who believe in the holy Catholic Church must not in reality, however unconsciously, be going on under this very appeal: at least, as against other claimants? The Greek will say, “I go by the voice of the present Church diffusive;” the Latin, “I go by the infallible voice of the See of S. Peter;” the English, “I go by what has been held fundamental every where, always, and by all:” but who is to decide between them, which of these measures is right? Yet all, one may hope, would agree to defer to the decision of such a Council as has been specified, were it obtainable. It is our common position; and we in England have so much the more reason to acquiesce in it, as it does not force us to “unchurch” (as it is termed) either of the other great

CHAP. V. sections of Christendom, as they do mutually one another and us.

Many a devout and loving heart, I well know, will rise up against this view of our case. To be on this conditional, temporary footing, will strike them as something so unsatisfactory, so miserably poor and meagre, so unlike the glorious vision which they have been used to gaze on of the one Catholic Apostolic Church. And poor, indeed, and disappointing it undoubtedly is, but not otherwise than as the aspect of Christianity itself in the world is poor and disappointing, compared with what we read of it in the Gospel.

Men will not escape from this state of decay by going elsewhere, though they may shut their eyes to the reality of it. Rather, whatever our position be in the Church, since God Almighty has assigned it to us for our trial, shall we not accept it and make the best of it, in humble confidence that according to our faith it will be to us?

This (please God) is the way of truth and peace, and therefore in it we may hope for a blessing; the rather, if it should prove to be the way of the Cross also. But to engage oneself by a strong act of the will, to the whole system of a body new to us, not upon the proper evidence of that system, but because some in temporary authority among ourselves have denied our holy doctrine—this has something in it so very unreal, that it can hardly agree with truth; and so like ill-temper, that it gives but a bad omen for peace. This is said, not from any special apprehension of such evil in store for us now, but from sad remembrance of what has occurred on former misinterpretations of our Church's doctrine.

But we may hope for better things. If only two kinds of people would be patient with one another—those who have hitherto worshipped Christ in the Eucharist undoubtingly, and those who for vague fear of certain errors have shrunk from owning, even to themselves, that they worshipped Him; if both sorts would pray and strive to be helped to take simply the plain words of Holy Scripture and the Church, as they do in respect of other mysteries;—then this Sacrament of peace, ceasing to be to believers a Sacrament of contention, would

be free to work its Lord's work among men: being, indeed, CHAP. V.  
that wonder-working Fire which He came to kindle on the  
earth, of power to transform and subdue all to itself.

Should what has been here set down contribute towards  
that blessed end but in one single instance, God be thanked!  
it will not have been written in vain.

---

NOTE on c. v. §. 3, 10, p. 161, 172.

As an exemplification of the course here recommended, I subjoin, 1. a copy of a Protest and Appeal, occasioned by the Primate's Decision in the Court at Bath; 2. a letter written in explanation of that paper by some of those who signed it, but suppressed at the time in deference to the scruples of others, who considered themselves implicated in it in a way which they thought unadvisable.

1. *Protest and Appeal.* (1856.)

"WE, the undersigned, Priests of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, called by God's Providence to minister in the Province of Canterbury, according to the Book of Common Prayer, do hereby, in the Presence of Almighty God, and in humble conformity with the tenor of our Ordination Vows, as we understand them, make known and declare as follows:—

1. We believe (in the words used in the Book of Homilies) that in the Holy Eucharist we "receive the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the form of bread and wine;" and with Bishop Cosin, "that upon the words of Consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this, not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner;" of which statement, Bishop Cosin says, "it is confessed by all Divines."

2. We believe, in the words of Bishop Ridley, "that the partakinge of Christ's Bodie and of His Bloude unto the faithfull and godlie, is the partakinge and fellowship of life and of immortalitie. And, again, of the bad and ungodlie

receivers, St. Paul plainlie saïeth thus : ‘ He that eateth of this breade and drinketh of this cuppe unworthilie, he is guilty of the Bodie and Bloude of the Lord. He that eateth and drinketh unworthilie, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lord’s Bodie ;’ that is, he receiveth not the Lord’s Bodie with the honoure whiche is due unto Hym.” Or with Bishop Poynt, “ that the Eucharist, so far as appertains to the nature of the Sacrament, is truly the Body and Blood of Christ, is a truly divine and holy thing, even when it is taken by the unworthy ; while, however, they are not partakers of its grace and holiness, but eat and drink their own death and condemnation.”

3. We hold, with Bishop Andrewes, that “ Christ Himself, the inward part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be worshipped.” With whom agrees Archbishop Bramhall : “ The Sacrament is to be adored, says the Council of Trent, that is, (formally,) ‘ the Body and Blood of Christ,’ say some of your authors ; we say the same : ‘ the Sacrament,’ that is, ‘ the species of bread and wine,’ say others ; that we deny.”

We therefore being convinced,

1. That the doctrine of the Real Presence of “ the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the form of Bread and Wine” has been uniformly held as a point of Faith in the Church from the Apostolic times ; and was accepted by General Councils, as it is also embodied in our own formularies ;—

2. That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the Church has been, that the wicked, although they can “ in no wise be partakers of Christ,” nor “ spiritually eat His Flesh and drink His Blood,” yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily to their own condemnation the Body and Blood of Christ, which they do not discern ;—

3. That the practice of worshipping Christ then and there especially present, after Consecration and before communicating, has been common throughout the Church :—

And moreover that the Thirty-nine Articles were intended

to be, and are, in harmony with the Faith and Teaching of the Ancient Undivided Church ;—

Do hereby protest earnestly against so much of the opinion of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, as implies, directly or indirectly, that such statements as we have cited above are repugnant to the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles ;—

And we appeal from the said opinion, decision, or sentence of his Grace, in the first instance, to a free and lawful synod of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury ; and then, if need be, to a free and lawful synod of all the Churches of our communion, when such by God's mercy may be had."

## *2. Letter in explanation of the foregoing.*

"It having been given out that those who signed the Protest and Appeal against the recent decision on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist may probably end in forming a Nonjuring Church, will you allow us to state through your paper, that we have no such intention or thought. The object of that declaration was to liberate our own consciences.

We believe, in their most literal and fullest sense, every word of the Articles, on the ground of which Archdeacon Denison has been condemned. We cannot see how the doctrines for which he has been condemned can be fairly brought under the Articles. We are convinced, that they are points upon which the Church of England has not decided ; and that those who have condemned him, have proceeded on grounds foreign to the Articles. They have brought meanings *into* the Articles, not *out* of them. Still, since we believe that which the Archbishop and his Assessors have condemned as contrary to the Articles, it became matter of honesty to avow it. We are in a place of sacred Trust. If we voluntarily retire from our place, we betray our Trust ; if we continue in our place, saying nothing, we *seem* to betray it. Either way there is grievous scandal. The only course open to us is publicly to apprize those in

authority over us, that we cannot obey them in this, and to go on as before, leaving it to them to interfere with us, or no, as they may think fit. It was on this view of our duty that we signed that Paper. Our subscription to the Articles is honest in itself, for we believe them in the only sense of which we can see them to be capable. But we did not feel it honest to hold a belief which had been condemned as contrary to the Articles, and not to avow that we held it, and make ourselves liable to the consequences.

The being of the Church of England we believe to be perfectly unaffected by this decision, grievous as the result of it may be in respect of her well-being. The sentence of an Archbishop's Court may make an Act penal; but the sentence of one man cannot bind the conscience. Prosecution after prosecution can but deprive individuals. Nothing less than the voice of the Church can make any decision the judgment of the Church; and nothing but the judgment of the Church (in fact, a new "Article of Religion") can limit, as now proposed, the meaning of the present Articles. If the Church of England should will to condemn what hitherto she has not condemned, she must do it by a distinct Act.

We know there are some who wish us to be removed. But we do not, please God, intend to do their work for them by withdrawing. Even should we be deprived, we should hope not to be silenced, nor degraded, nor excommunicated. Meantime, in full conviction that we teach only what the Church sanctions, or at any rate allows, we shall go on teaching as long as we are permitted to do so. Through God's good Providence we have had our several spheres of duty assigned to us. If it be His Will, He will help us cheerfully to exchange them for others. But it will be His doing, not ours. We hope to know His Will best, by waiting for it."

Contrib. Kells. Paper on the State of the Relation  
with the Church - 1839 (reprinted by 1st Edition  
in 1869) -

Kells sermon on Practical Piety 1837. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition  
near Race No 78. (a common pattern in the study  
of manhood in fact) -







“THE STATE IN ITS RELATIONS WITH  
THE CHURCH:”

A PAPER REPRINTED FROM THE “BRITISH CRITIC,”  
OCTOBER, 1839.

BY THE LATE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

VICAR OF HURSLEY.

WITH A PREFACE BY THE REV. H. P. LIDDON.



Oxford and London:  
JAMES PARKER AND CO.

1869.



## PREFACE.

---

**D**URING the past year many Churchmen have asked the question, If Mr. Keble were still among us, what would he say about the proposed Disestablishment of the Irish Church?

That question has received an answer which has necessarily commanded attention. We have been told that "Mr. Keble acknowledged the justice of disestablishing the Irish Church <sup>a</sup>." For this assertion the highest authority can be produced <sup>b</sup>. But it has been represented to the present writer that such an assertion is, in its naked form, too unqualified to convey a true impression of Mr. Keble's general mind on the subject, or rather, however undesignedly, not to convey an untrue one. Accordingly the following Essay is reprinted, not as contradicting but as supplementing and balancing the opinion referred to; as furnishing some cautions and qualifications with which any such broad statement would assuredly have been accompanied, at the least, in the speaker's mind; and, in short, as filling up a background, the moral and religious colouring of which shews that with Mr. Keble the same formula would have borne a somewhat different meaning from that which would be connected with it in ordinary political language.

Not that this Essay is altogether, at first sight, calculated

<sup>a</sup> "A Chapter of Autobiography. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone," p. 52, note †.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. "A Memoir of the late Rev. John Keble, M.A., by the Right Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge, D.C.L." (Oxford: Parker, 1869), p. 518. Describing his last interview with Mr. Keble, Dr. Newman writes: "Mr. Gladstone's rejection at Oxford was talked of, and I said that I really thought that had I been still a member of the University, I must have voted against him, because he was giving up the Irish Establishment. On this Keble gave me one of his remarkable looks, so earnest and so sweet, came close to me, and whispered in my ear, (I cannot recollect the exact words, but I took them to be,) 'And is not that just?'"

to secure such an object. In the first place it is a review. As it happens, it is a review of that work of Mr. Gladstone's earlier years which has of late been quarried so largely with a view to furnishing *ad hominem* arguments, such as Mr. Keble certainly would not have employed, against its distinguished author. As a reviewer, Mr. Keble deals with his subject incidentally, partially, indirectly; it is not his business to observe the proportions of formal and exhaustive discussion; he contents himself with examining particular features of the book before him, which invite, in his judgment, some measured criticism, and much earnest, nay enthusiastic, approval. This should be borne in mind, in order to prevent disappointment. From the nature and necessity of the case, the reader is presented only with a fragment of the writer's mind on a very large subject; and this moreover in that indirect form which belongs to the discussion, not of a subject in itself, but of the opinions of others about it. Had Mr. Keble been writing a treatise on such a matter, it is unnecessary to say that he would have said much which is unsaid here; while, it is at least possible, that in some few and unimportant particulars he would have been led to express himself differently.

In the second place, when the revered author of this review was called to his rest, more than a quarter of a century had already passed since its appearance in the then brilliant pages of the "British Critic<sup>c</sup>." It is natural to enquire whether, during that long series of anxious years, the opinions of so active a mind on a subject of such intricacy and difficulty may not have undergone, did not undergo, some important modifications.

Now, apart from the particular expression of opinion which has been already referred to, there is good reason for believing, that this Essay represents, in the main, Mr. Keble's latest opinions on the subject which it discusses. For to the last he was deeply sensible of the force and soundness of arguments which, abstractedly, are to be

<sup>c</sup> It will be found in the number for October, 1839.

alleged in support of the establishment of the Church by a Christian nation. But the readers of this paper will remark its concluding pages, and especially its concluding paragraphs. Mr. Keble, it is plain, was already afraid of an enthusiasm for establishments, which should lose sight of the rights and sacredness of the truth which is established. He was nearer, much nearer, to Mr. Gladstone's present position on this subject than was Mr. Gladstone himself. "While we deprecate," he says, "as earnestly as the author, or any of those who think with him, the great national sin of rejecting the Church, there is one thing we are free to confess, which appears to us yet more to be dreaded, and that is, the Church herself being induced, by fear of public evil, or any other cause, to forego any of her sacred principles for the sake of retaining her connection, real or nominal, with the State." And, as the years passed on, events combined to increase his sense of the imminence and greatness of this "more dreaded" danger. When the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, overruling the decisions of the Church's own courts, decided as it did, first in the Gorham case, and later in that of the "Essays and Reviews," Mr. Keble felt that it was the principle of Establishments, under our existing circumstances, that was really upon its trial. He used often in this sense to say that we should have soon to choose between our faith and our position. He did not of course suppose for one moment that any judgment of a court of civilians, however highly placed, or individually accomplished, upon a question of religious truth, could really mould the faith or govern the conscience of loyal and well-informed members of the Church of God. But he dreaded acquiescence in the continued existence and activity of such a court, as involving in fact "a sinful neglect of our Lord's will and object in instituting the ministry of His Church." How earnestly he took part in the movement which followed the "Essay and Review" decision, and which, alas! led to no results, was known to all who knew anything of his mind and occupations. "We never ought

to rest," he said more than once, "until that unhappy court is either reconstituted or abolished."

In the case of Dr. Colenso, Mr. Keble's anxieties respecting the spiritual dangers of Establishment "at any price" received a new impulse. Long before the trial and deposition of Dr. Colenso by the Episcopate of South Africa, Mr. Keble had maintained that some similar measure was necessary, if the Church was still to bear her witness to Christ. "I think I know," he said sharply on one occasion, "how St. Athanasius would have acted in this matter." It might have been supposed that an unestablished Church, like that in South Africa, would have been allowed to vindicate the truth of Holy Scripture by rejecting a pastor who denied it, without encountering let or hinderance on the part of the civil power. But experience has shewn that the disadvantages of an Establishment may have a wider range of incidence than its blessings; and the South African Church, herself unestablished, has paid dearly for a connection, which should have been only a source of spiritual life and strength, with the parent and Established Church of England. It is unnecessary to repeat in detail a sad story, the particulars of which are still fresh in the wounded hearts of Churchmen. Suffice it to say that, with Mr. Keble as with many others, the South African controversy did its work, as he said, "its providential work," in reminding us that worse evils may threaten modern Churches even than total dis-establishment. In the summer of 1865, in private conversation, he asked a friend, which of the colonial bishops, in his opinion, had done most for the Church in our day. On receiving an answer, he paused and said, "No; I cannot agree. If you ask me, I say, the Bishop of Cape Town. He seems to me to be the noblest, the greatest, taken altogether;—and, depend upon it, he is teaching us a lesson which we shall before very long have to apply here at home."

It is in the light of these convictions that Mr. Keble's saying, to which Mr. Gladstone has alluded, must probably be set, in order to be duly estimated. Although it fell from

him while he was talking intimately to a friend, with whom it was natural to make the most of all possible points of sympathy, and even then in an interrogative form, which was characteristic of his own self distrust; it represented, we cannot doubt, a serious moral conviction, based upon an attentive consideration of Irish difficulties, and more particularly of those which arise from the religious convictions of the mass of the Irish people. Such consideration, indeed, he was too religiously just to have refused in any case; but to give it may have been all the easier, if he felt that "justice" (whatever that inclusive term may exactly mean) could be dealt out to the majority of Irishmen, without inflicting an unmitigated injustice on the minority; unless, indeed, it is unjust to deprive a not unwilling man of a position of outward honour, really fraught with peril to his health and life<sup>d</sup>. That the majority of the Irish bishops and clergy would have taken Mr. Keble's later view of the relative advantages and disadvantages of Church establishments in our own day, was not perhaps to have been assumed without enquiry; but the expressions in question, as it appears to the present writer, are in part to be interpreted by the supposition, certainly not dishonourable to themselves, of their doing so.

It will be observed that Mr. Keble says nothing about dis-endowment; a measure which, in some degree, it is presumed, must accompany the dis-establishment of the Irish Church. What he would have thought of a transfer of some portion of the Irish Church property to the pastors of the majority of the Irish people, cannot now be affirmed with any certainty; but it is certain that he would have regarded any application of such property to purposes of secular education, or of non-religious philanthropy, as a distinct sin on

<sup>d</sup> The writer does not forget that in Ireland the Final Court of Appeal is the old Court of Delegates, and not the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But even if the composition of the Court of Delegates were religiously consistent with the preamble of the 24 Henry VIII., its principles and decisions would, almost inevitably, be governed by those of the Judicial Committee, not less entirely than are those of the Arches Court of Canterbury.

the part of the country against Almighty God, to Whose service it had been devoted. And those who knew him best can best imagine what he would have thought and said of a proposal, with which Mr. Gladstone most assuredly is not to be credited;—the proposal, I mean, to strip the Irish Church of her endowments with one hand, while perpetuating State-courts and State-interference in her concerns with the other;—the cruel proposal to turn her out in her old age, famished and barefooted, into the cold; and withal, in a spirit of jealous suspicion, worthy of the narrowest and least religious species of Erastianism, to load her enfeebled limbs with rusty irons that were forged by extinct despotisms, lest, forsooth, while she is providing herself with the barest necessities of life, she should become “dangerous” to the spiritual liberties of her despoilers.

If Churchmen state their principles strongly, they are not therefore forgetful of the difficulties of statesmen who have to recognise, as best they may, a vast variety of conflicting interests, but who do in their hearts desire, as they understand it, the well-being and the honour of the Kingdom of Christ. And if the accompanying paper leaves untouched much of the ground which has been traversed so generally in the present controversies, it holds up to view, and that very distinctly, some considerations by which, in the judgment of earnest men, such controversies ought, in whatever proportions, to be controlled; and thus it raises the reader for the time being into a higher atmosphere, upon which the acrimonies and personalities of ordinary debate cannot intrude, and in which truths are of more account than men, and loyalty to light than fear of consequences. This, indeed, alone might justify its republication; since in any case it is good to sit at the feet of a teacher who illustrates a spirit and enforces principles which should govern a more extended discussion than his own.

H. P. LIDDON.

CHRIST CHURCH,  
*February 9th, 1869.*

## THE STATE IN ITS RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH<sup>a</sup>.

---

IF we may, without irreverence, form a conjecture on the providential tendency of things as we see them, we should be inclined to say, that in the turn which events have been taking among us, often most contrary to human expectation, for the last ten or eleven years, we may perhaps discern symptoms of two main overruling purposes, such as may hereafter serve as a key to not the least intricate of the chapters of English history. Ever since the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill, perhaps we might say ever since the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the stream of events seems to have tended on the one hand to the permanent elevation of the enemies of the Church in the State, on the other hand to the preservation, in spite of them, of her substance and framework, as well as to the revival of her spirit among us. How many times during this long struggle has it appeared, that, according to all political calculation, the Conservative party must be on the point of triumphing, and as often some unexpected event, some caprice or accident, which could not be reckoned upon, has disconcerted all man's expectations, and left us just where we were, excepting, of course, the gradual power which the movement cannot but acquire from its continuance. On the other hand, have we not repeatedly seen measures which even the defenders of order, united more or less with its disturbers in patronizing, unaccountably lingering and impeded when there was hardly a minority to skirmish with them, and failing and postponed session after session by some defect in form, or

<sup>a</sup> "The State in its Relations with the Church. By W. E. Gladstone, Esq., Student of Christ Church, and M.P. for Newark." Third Edition. (London: Murray, 1839.)

other inexplicable forgetfulness? The Cathedral Bill, now three years old, yet hardly born, will occur to every one; and we may mention the bill for admitting Dissenters to the Universities, the abolition of the See of Sodor and Man, the various Education schemes, and, even as we write, we hope we may venture to add, the Church Discipline Bill. There are circumstances in the history of each of these, which, taken together, suggest the idea of a peculiar guardianship over this part of Christ's household, exercised in a trying and perplexing conjuncture to prevent us from inadvertently betraying ourselves. May it be said, without presumption, that, conjoining them with the other series, the two together seem to point to a high but trying and perilous destiny, as probably reserved for the coming generation of our Lord's faithful servants in this realm? We may be mistaken; but the review of them seems to us to produce an impression analogous to that which has been stated to result from a certain cast of features, majestic yet melancholy, such as those of King Charles I.: they lead, as we contemplate them, in spite of ourselves, to anticipations of violence borne with composure; they seem to bid us hope that our Lord will still have a Church here, yet to warn us that its existence must be purchased by no slight privation and suffering.

Supposing anticipations somewhat like these to occupy the mind of a thoughtful Churchman, he would probably notice the appearance of such a work as Mr. Gladstone's as a powerful confirmation both to his fears and hopes. Here we have no village theorizer, no cloistered alarmist, but a public man and a man of the world, a statesman of the highest talent for business, an orator who commands the ear of the House of Commons, so deeply impressed with the perils of our Church's position at this moment, that he makes time to develope and express his views, deep and manifold, and brought out with serious labour, of the very sacred nature of her connection with the State, if haply he may lead any to think earnestly of it who have hitherto treated it as a mere party question; we find him writing in a tone, not indeed of despondency, but of very deep and serious alarm; not as one who gave up the defence of a

place, but as one who thought the time was come for making a last effort, and calling out those who would not shrink from a forlorn hope.

“I know not,” he says, “whether it be presumptuous to say . . . that the changes which have appeared, and which are daily unfolding themselves, in connection with the movement towards the overthrow of National Church Establishments, seem as if they were gradually supplying what yet remained void in those fore-ordered dispensations of the Deity towards man which are traced throughout the history of this wayward world<sup>b</sup>.”

And again:—

“In combating the obstinate irreligion of the world, it is something that the authentic permanent convictions of men are declared, beyond dispute, to be with us by the legalized existence and support of the fixed institutions of religion; but the conclusion towards which we are now led and driven, threatened and cajoled, will reverse the whole of this beneficial influence, and will throw it into the opposite direction, to co-operate with the scoffer, the profligate, the unbelieving, the indifferent, when it shall be told, amidst the exultation of some and the tears of others, that there was a time when the power of thrones and the paternal functions of government bore witness to the faith of Christ, and that the witness is now withdrawn, and thus the truth emphatically denied<sup>c</sup>.”

The cast of these sentences is evidently anything but sanguine; and considering Mr. Gladstone's character and position, we cannot but regard the simple fact of his allowing himself in such forebodings as a striking lesson to the too easy friends of Church and State, of whom there are still a good many who shake their heads indeed abundantly at each bad measure as it comes on, yet obstinately refuse to contemplate, as a possible contingency, the result of the whole, or anything else which would disturb the even tenor of their Sundays and week-days, their summer tours, and winter dining-parties. Surely it were well to look things in the face, and be prepared with some notion what our own

<sup>b</sup> Chap. viii. 2.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* 29.

duties would be in a case which has been pronounced on such authority so far from impossible.

But further: we find also in Mr. Gladstone's undertaking, warrant for the more consolatory part of our own anticipations. He states the more immediate occasion of his work to be an apprehended co-operation of two very different classes in the work of dissolving the Church Establishment. Having mentioned Destructives of various sorts, he adds<sup>d</sup>, that "others of a different stamp are beginning to view the connection of Church and State with an eye of aversion or indifference; men attached to the State, but more affectionately and intimately cleaving to the Church, unwilling to regard the two as in any sense having opposite interests, but wearied, perhaps exasperated, at the injustice done of late years, or rather during recent generations, by the temporal to the spiritual body; injustice, inasmuch as the State has too frequently perverted and abused the institutions of the Church by unworthy patronage, has crippled or suppressed her lawful powers, and has, lastly, when these same misdeeds have raised a strong sentiment of disfavour against its ally, evinced an inclination to make a separate peace and surrender her to the will of her adversaries. Such being the case, we can hardly wonder, though we may lament it, that some attached members of the Church are growing cool in their approbation of the connection—"

We stop the quotation to demur to the next clause, "under the influence of a nascent and unconscious resentment:" first, because the feeling in such cases is commonly, we apprehend, far too vivid to be unconscious; it gives warning of itself, and puts men of high principles on their guard very distinctly from the beginning: next, because it is begging the question to assume that the scruples referred to are matter of personal feeling, and not of conscientious regard to rights and trusts; and there are other considerations to be presently mentioned. But we return to the immediate purpose for which we were referring to these expressions: they are consolatory so far as this, that they testify to the existence of no inconsiderable body of men, so deeply

<sup>d</sup> Chap. i. § 2.

rooted in right principles, that, instead of fearing lest they should be tempted to compromise the Church itself for the Establishment, sagacious observers are only alarmed lest they too easily forego the advantages of the Establishment for the Church's sake. So that, come what will, we may hope, please God, to have a faithful remnant in our land; and that surely is as much as in any case attentive readers of Church history could well dare expect.

But Mr. Gladstone's publication is also most encouraging in another way; from the earnest it gives us that even in the high places of the State there are those who never will forsake the City of God, and still more from the rare and noble specimen which it exhibits of what sound religious (in which term we include sound ecclesiastical) principles can do for a person in the most dangerous walks of life; how neither political nor intellectual importance can mar the freshness, the simplicity, the generosity, and (more than all, for it lies at the root of all) the reverential spirit with which the Church's true scholars enter on these high and delicate practical discussions. We will say no more, for we feel as if this were one of the cases where praise is little better than impertinence; only we must just point out his dedication as an unequivocal instance of the tone which his work preserves throughout, and of the uncompromising desire which he evidently feels to stand in all events irrevocably committed to the cause of primitive truth and order. He inscribes his work to the University of Oxford, "in the hope that the temper of it may be found not alien from her own." To appreciate worthily such an avowal as this, one ought probably to know more of the House of Commons, and of the tone of high metropolitan society at present, than we, or perhaps most of our readers, do. But we should not, it may be, greatly err, if we considered it as an instance of courage akin to that of Jonathan, when he remonstrated with his over-politic and tyrannical father, "Who is so faithful among all the king's servants as David?" Or, to take a yet graver example, it may remind us of that highly favoured one, who was cast out of the synagogue for saying, "Herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes."

It is part of this earnest and thoughtful view that he has declined the term "alliance" in the title of his work, as implying too much personal distinction, and suggesting the low and false doctrine that the State is free to choose in such a matter. We are rejoiced to have his high authority in deprecating a mode of speech so apt to mislead: and the need of some such caution is the more apparent, as we perceive that Mr. Gladstone himself has not always been able to avoid it<sup>e</sup>; and it may perhaps have here and there communicated to his reasonings an unconscious tinge, we will not say of Erastianism, but of State as distinct from Church policy. In other writers, and those too such as we are bound to regard with much gratitude and respect, the ill-effect of such phraseology is still more apparent. How, for example, but by the inveterate use of it, are we to account for such a sentiment as the following, adopted by way of deprecation of certain "complaints of the State's usurpation," by a writer who in other ways has shewn so true a sense of the Church's claims? "The Church is not united to the State as Israel to Egypt: it is united as a believing wife to a husband who threatens to apostatize; and as a Christian wife so placed would act, with patience, and love, and tears, and zealous entreaties, and prayers, hoping even against hope, and clinging to the connection until a law of God dissevered it: so the Church must struggle even now, and save not herself but the State from the crime of a divorce<sup>f</sup>."

We had thought that the Spouse of the Church was a very different Person from any or all States, and her relation to the State, through Him, very unlike that whose duties are summed up in "love, service, cherishing, and obedience." And since the one is exclusively of this world, the other essentially of the eternal world, such an alliance as the above sentence describes, would have seemed to us not only fatal but monstrous:—

"Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis,  
Componens manibusque manus, atque oribus ora:  
Tormenti genus:—

To us, we confess, the word Incorporation, though Mr.

<sup>e</sup> See chap. ii. 61, 69; chap. iv. 4, 7—9.

<sup>f</sup> "Quarterly Review," No. cxxvi. p. 561.

Gladstone at once discards it, would have appeared in the abstract far preferable to Marriage, Alliance, Union, or any other like them; provided always that we understand it as the meaning of the terms requires, of the admission of any particular State, as of any particular individual, into the bosom of the holy Universal Church; reserving the superiority, according to the idea of a Corporation, to the body adopting, for the benefit of the member adopted.

We are bound in fairness to acknowledge that Mr. Gladstone's theory, though remote from the lax and unworthy notions unwarily sanctioned in the passage just animadverted on, yet seems hardly to come up to our own view of the relations of Church and State. The way in which he arrives at it is briefly this:—for we think it best shortly to analyse his argument, clear as it is, and certain as we deem it that almost all our readers are long since familiar with it. It is the fairest way in reviewing argumentative works, for the same reason that in actual debate it is well to state what you understand to be the drift of the other party before you allege your own views.—

He begins by a short notice of the most popular among former theories on the relation of the Church to the State: Hooker, Warburton, Paley, Coleridge, Dr. Chalmers. Of these he finds some entirely deficient in principle, such as Warburton and Paley, both of whom in fact deny to the State any conscience in the matter, making it the business of Governments to ally themselves, not with that society which Christ established, but with any sect which may suit best their political purposes. Dr. Chalmers sets out on the same road with them, but parts company when the question is started, "What is to be done when the prevalent sect is unevangelical in doctrine?" Allowing therefore the principle, that the State has a conscience, and is bound to teach the truth, but denying whatever is high and transcendental in the claims of the Church, *as a Church*, i.e. as the Kingdom of Christ, and not merely a witness of His Truth. With Hooker and Coleridge, Mr. Gladstone seems substantially to agree in principle, but he complains that neither of them applies so immediately as might be wished to the exigencies of our present condition; the former treating rather of the

terms than of the ground of the Union, and of those with almost an exclusive eye to the controversies of his own day; the latter confining himself to a sketch of his view in the abstract, with hardly anything of detail or practical application. The extreme theories of Hobbes and Bellarmine, the one making the whole Church the creature of the State, the other the State the slave of the particular Church of Rome, he thinks it enough just to mention, as beacons on opposite sides of the course to be pursued. Hobbes's is in fact the same with that of Machiavelli and others, which Hooker denominates "godless politics," and is essentially atheistical, at least if it be atheism virtually to deny God's moral government. In our days, the same impiety vents itself in a different kind of policy; instead of counterfeiting one religion to keep in order an ignorant superstitious generation, we are counselled to neglect all, that an enlightened philosophical race may have scope for its energies. A change in the controversy, by no means insignificant among the many symptoms, which seem just now to shew which way Modern Europe is verging, in such measure as she has thrown off her reverence for the Holy Catholic Church.

Against this latter form of practical atheism in particular, the notion that the civil magistrate as such has nothing to do with religion, Mr. Gladstone advances in substance the following propositions, which contain what we may call his own theory of the mutual relations of the two societies, and which he addresses to all who believe God's moral government. *First*, Governors, *as individuals*, lie under an obligation to profess and maintain religion in their government as in other parts of their conduct. *Secondly*, the State itself, taken *collectively*, has a personal existence, a duty and a conscience, and is therefore bound *collectively* to the same profession and maintenance. *Thirdly*, if externally able and internally qualified, and if the same thing cannot be so well done otherwise, the State ought to extend and propagate the same religion through the nation. But the same thing cannot be so well done otherwise, as the failure of the voluntary system, left alone, proves; and the State is externally competent, both as having the means of endowment, and as coming to men's minds with authority, and appealing both

to their sympathies and interests: and lastly, the government is intrinsically competent, i.e. in proportion as it is good government, it attracts to itself those among the people who are best qualified to choose in matter of religion.

This last statement, it is important to observe, constitutes no necessary part of the argument: as Mr. Gladstone himself has remarked<sup>g</sup>, "Even if we suppose that the Government had no such superiority, we are still at liberty to argue that it is bound to establish a religion." And it is well that he has so guarded himself; for undoubtedly a theory would not seem likely to carry much weight which depended for its practical effect upon the statement that this or any other Government is apt to attract to itself "the best wisdom of the nation:" by which, in this instance, must be meant the persons best qualified to judge of religious truth. Such a proposition is valid indeed as an *argumentum ad hominem*, when we are reasoning with idolizers of the State; as it is with reformers enamoured of their own power, and expecting all good from the development of their principles. To them, if reason could silence them, it would be reasonable to say, "By your own account the improved constitution of England is such as to engage in the actual government of the nation those who are best fitted to make choice in all important questions for the rest; you cannot, therefore, if you will be consistent, deny them a natural influence in religion also." But what if any person, so far from adopting this sanguine view, should believe that, according to present arrangements, it is morally impossible but that unsound and superficial notions, even on most of the great temporal questions, should prevail, generally speaking, in the councils of his country? What if he should think that all experience is against the idea that successful political partizans are commonly good judges of religious truth? What if the very nature of the case exclude them, *as a class*? That there may be splendid exceptions we thankfully allow. Surely it will be difficult to exclude from this subject the application of the text, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." If the best judges of religious truth are those who

<sup>g</sup> Chap. ii. 47.

most devoutly practise religion ; if the high places of the world are eminently unfavourable to the Kingdom of God ; if the poor, as such, are "chosen to be rich in faith ;" if "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light ;" then, whatever favourable exceptions a merciful Providence may at times allow, it does not seem easy even to imagine a country so constituted, that the best judges in matters of religion shall be permanently or commonly the prevailing party in it.

Waiving therefore this portion of the argument, we may yet concur most heartily with Mr. Gladstone in all that he proceeds to say of the inducements which the State has to employ its means according to its competency, be that competency little or much, for the recommendation and propagation of religious truth, and especially of the Church. Besides the reasons which are commonly alleged on this head, he dwells with unanswerable force on the two following topics : the subjugation of individual will by the discipline of the Church, and the permanency of its doctrines and institutions ; which latter again brings this great collateral advantage, that whereas,

"It is most difficult and invidious for Governors to select any one form of mere opinion as such, and endow it ; or any institution, simply preferred because the doctrines taught in it are agreeable to the views entertained by themselves : the Church professes to be an institution not deduced by human reason from any general declaration of God's will, but actually and (so to speak) bodily given by God, founded through His direct inspiration, and regularly transmitted in a divinely appointed though human line. The State, therefore, does not here propose an opinion of its own for the approbation of the people, but a system to which it has itself yielded faith and homage as of divine authority. The difference is twofold : it is that between inheritance and acquisition ; it is that between an attested and a conjectural authority from God<sup>h</sup>."

Lastly, it is argued, that the support and promotion of the Church, thus on State principles made imperative, must also

<sup>h</sup> Chap. ii. 61.

be *exclusive*, even on the same principles, and still more when her own sacred law of unity is considered. If in any country either the governing body or the whole state be unhappily so divided in religion that this object cannot be achieved, "we do not here trace out all the consequences, but it has been shewn that this involves dereliction of the functions and responsibilities of Government; and it is enough for the present to have marked it as *a social defect and calamity*<sup>i</sup>."

We are too well aware how little justice we have done in this brief and meagre summary to Mr. Gladstone's statement of his leading principles. But his style is so condensed, and so full of matter, that we feel an adequate analysis to be out of the question. A paraphrase, occasionally, seems rather what is wanted to bring out the connection and relative importance of various portions of the argument, in which the author perhaps has given his readers credit for more of his own thoughtfulness than they are likely to possess. In this, as in some other respects, he reminds us sometimes of Aristotle's manner in the *Ethics*; although the tone of strong but subdued feelings, which is the great charm of the Christian statesman's work, be rarely and faintly heard from the heathen moralist.

We have mentioned that the treatise has throughout an aspect to two classes of opponents, who are supposed likely to unite in disparaging the Establishment as such; and to the answering of their objections in detail, the author addresses himself in the chapters which follow the second. On the first sort of scruples, however, those, namely, which are felt by Liberals of all classes about the question, whether the State has anything to do with Religion, it is not our purpose now to dwell, any further than to express our surprise that any writer of tolerable acuteness should have fancied the affirmative sufficiently disproved by merely finding out ludicrous analogies for the doctrine of the State's personality and its having a conscience. It is said<sup>k</sup>, "at this rate our Railway and Insurance Companies, our agricultural, astronomical, horticultural meetings, nay, our cricket and chess clubs, are religious

<sup>i</sup> Chap. ii. 71.

<sup>k</sup> See "Edinburgh Review," April, 1839.

societies, and are bound in conscience to exclude unbelievers and apply some test to the religious opinions of all whom they employ."

Now, raillery apart, is it not certain that all companies and associations of Christians are, in a very true sense, religious societies? Would the deviser of these facetious sayings, if seriously asked, himself deny that each and all of the associations which have been named come within the Apostolical rule, "Do all to the glory of God?" and that accordingly, if they can anyhow be any of them turned towards the end of God's kingdom, it is our duty so to turn them? But this once allowed, (and it seems almost an axiom, unless men are content to deny His moral government,) "the rest," as some one has said, "is matter of calculation." The director of a railroad or coach company is to consider whether the great end is or is not likely to be promoted by his discouragement of Sunday travelling, of drunkenness and blasphemy, among those who are for the time, and to a certain extent, committed to his charge. The master of a family has to consider whether or no the interests of morality, i. e. regard to God's will, require him in any particular case to practise what is called invidiously exclusive dealing. The obligation in every such instance, how inferior soever in importance, is the same in kind with that which, in the case of Governments, appears to certain philosophic statesmen mere matter of scorn and ridicule. If they carry their principles out in their domestic arrangements, all we can say is, may our servants keep at a distance from their servants, and our children from their children.

This might be said even on the lowest view of the origin of civil government, and supposing it no more of divine institution than any of the voluntary combinations above mentioned. But with Mr. Gladstone the province of the statesman is as much more awful than these, and more sacred in its kind, as it is more momentous in reach and extent. The will of God, as made known by the course of universal Providence, and by the unsophisticated feelings of all mankind, is surely his warrant, when he pours himself out, as in the following noble passage, on the true nature of

his calling as a political man, and the responsibility which belongs to all who take on themselves any part of the conduct of a nation.

“Habituated to the false or secondary conceptions which arise out of our inveterate political sectarianism, we are very apt to look upon the State in an irreverent or careless temper, and to forget that next to the Church it exhibits the grandest of all combinations of human beings. It is a venerable idea, in which the supremacy of law as opposed to mere will is asserted, by which the sociality and inter-dependence of our nature are proclaimed, and the best acts and thoughts are arrested and perpetuated in institutions, and a collective wisdom is made available for individuals, and the individual is humbled and disciplined by being kept in qualified subordination to the mass. The adoption of a moral principle, or scheme, or institution, by the State, is among the most solemn and the most pregnant of human acts: and although it cannot place what it adopts upon a ground higher than its own, any more than water can rise above its level, yet that ground is one of an order having more of natural justice, more of experimentally-demonstrated permanence, more of divine authentication, than any other except the Church, which it feebly though perceptibly imitates; and certainly much more than that private will, which, sooner or later, learns to wanton in the whole spirit and practice of dissent, reversing every fundamental law of the universe, and asserting the isolation, and deifying the arbitrary caprice, of man<sup>1</sup>.”

We do not envy those who can find in such aspirations as these matter of derision, as if it were all but mere mysticism; nor do we see how, consistently with their view, they can profess to receive as unerring, a Book which declares that by the Wisdom and Word of the Most High, by the Providence of His Son, and under Him, “kings reign and princes decree justice;” and not only kings and princes, but all who are concerned in the legitimate exercise of government, even “all the judges of the earth<sup>m</sup>;” which verse, if we read its meaning rightly, (and that we do so we have the

<sup>1</sup> Chap. iii. § 39.

<sup>m</sup> Proverbs viii. 15, 16.

concurrent witness of the whole Church in its first and pure ages,) represents to us civil governors, and especially kings, as manifestations, in their several spheres, of our Lord and Saviour; not less really so than His priests are in His Church, though with different and inferior functions. It can be no light perversion of mind, which would lead any school or any individual to deal with an institution so warranted and originated, as if it were no more sacred in its kind, had no more to do with God's universal government, than any of the fleeting and frivolous assemblages of the day. Dismissing therefore, as decidedly irreligious, this whole class of objections, we shall address ourselves, in what we have further to say, to the other side, which only, to Churchmen, is the side of practical difficulty. Mr. Gladstone professes to vindicate, not only the abstract principle of establishment, but also the particular form in which the relation of Church and State appears in this country at present; not only the ground, but the terms of the union. In doing so, he has sometimes expressed himself as if he thought that not only the more conscientious sort of Dissenters, but some too who would be accounted High Churchmen, had been led by events to disparage and deprecate the principle itself, of the incorporation of the State in the Church. Now we must once for all avow, that we know not anywhere of this combination of opinions. We have never met with, we have never read of, any set of persons admitting the divine origin and paramount claims of the Apostolical Church, yet denying the obligation of the civil magistrate to enter into relations with it. All the scruples and demurs that we have met with in such persons have had reference, not to the principle of incorporation, but to the terms of it in this or that particular instance. We apprehend, therefore, that Mr. Gladstone is mistaken if he thinks, as some of his expressions appear to imply, that anything which has happened in the way of wrong done to the Church, or of unworthy compromise on the part of her defenders, has caused *such* religionists to doubt or deny the duty of the State to connect itself with the Church. They are perfectly aware of that duty, and of the danger of falling away from it; as will

have been seen by the application of the text in Proverbs, just above, (if that may be admitted as a fair statement of their views,) they are quite convinced that both Church and State are (though in several ways) of divine appointment; that kings as well as bishops are in a manner representatives of Jesus Christ on earth, consequently that our duties to the one, rightly understood, can never by any possibility clash with our duties to the other. Nay, they may perhaps be ready to go further than the plan of Mr. Gladstone's work enabled him to do, in asserting, not only the wisdom and rectitude, but the positive divine institution, of a certain relation between the Church and the State. They may think that Holy Scripture distinctly shews us the seal of the Almighty, set to the reasonings of wise men, and the natural feelings of religious men, in favour of that connection; feelings and reasonings, before sufficient to constitute a strong practical obligation, but which, so confirmed, come to us as remembrancers from above of a duty which may not be denied nor evaded. To go no further for the present in Scripture: such persons might even be content to rest their doctrine on the well-known texts of Isaiah<sup>n</sup>, which represent the temporal powers as Nursing Fathers and Mothers to the children of the Church; texts which have been often and ably alleged as virtually containing the terms of the union in question, and which it seems hard for any sophistry to expound, so as that they shall not plainly express a divine sanction and ground for that union. And that which is divinely sanctioned and grounded cannot in itself be a cause of degeneracy and sin. No fear, then, lest those who, with the unanswerable Leslie<sup>o</sup>, interpret those prophetic sayings as a divine intimation of the duty of the State to the Church, should ever give in, as seems to be suspected, to the tenet of the upholders of the modern voluntary system; that *any* positive connection of the Church with the powers of this world, is in the very nature of the case, sure to lower both her doctrine and her morals.

Where, then, is the point of difference between those who sympathize with such writers as Leslie, and those who really venerate primitive antiquity, yet still continue anxious de-

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xlix. 22, 23; lx. 3, 4, 10, 12, 16.

<sup>o</sup> Case of the Regale, § 6.

fenders of things as they are among ourselves? Practically, we apprehend, it comes to this; rather to lessen their satisfaction and confidence with the former in the cause, than to withdraw from the ranks. In elections they will still be found voting for the Conservative candidate; their names will not be wanting, when the proper authorities are to be appealed to, in behalf of such influences as the Government still allows the Church to exert on it: they feel that it is the part of resignation and obedience to go on, though in much doubt and perplexity, and keep things quiet as long as ever conscience will allow, but they dare not conceal that they do so with a heavy heart, and in continual fear of giving up truth and duty; they cannot sympathize with the notes of exultation with which eager partizans and shallow speculators welcome each onward step of what they call the cause of the Church. They feel themselves continually called to the disagreeable duty of protesting against the lax notions and irreverent proceedings of those with whom themselves are acting; of damping unseasonable triumphs, and checking plans of policy and compromise, often devised in good faith, but tending, as they clearly see, to the surrender of something which they dare not give up; of silencing their own scruples and regrets, in deference to the wishes of those who have a right to direct them, when, according to all the rules in which they have been instructed, perhaps by those very authorities, the time of passive resistance would seem to be full come; and for half a life perhaps they have to lie down and rise up in a corroding uncertainty, whether or no they are doing their best, according to their station, to warn their country and their countrymen of the fatal consequences of dealing rudely with God's Church.

Such, it seems to us, would be some of the sensations with which one thoroughly imbued with ancient principles would find himself continually forced to qualify his adherence, under present circumstances, to the supporters of the connection of Church and State in this kingdom. Nor will any one be surprised at the statement who will consider how much the trial of us all consists in doubts and perplexities about duty, stationed as we are in paths made intricate by our own sins and errors and those of our forefathers.

In justice to our own view, we must mention some of the particulars, though to most of our readers they will probably occur of themselves, which may not unnaturally cause a public man to feel dejected and embarrassed, even in asserting a cause which at first glance would seem to combine all that is elevating and ennobling. And if in doing so we have incidentally to question some of Mr. Gladstone's positions, we shall do so with less scruple, because the influences are, to our view, so evident, which would lead a person in his circumstances to survey with too favourable an eye the alliance as it exists. A statesman admitted behind the scenes must see, we fear, so much of moral unsoundness and decay in every department, as to make him more than ever unwilling to part with any little relic of homage which may but seem to be still paid to Religion, and he has the same kind of temptation to overvalue it, and pay too dear for it, as clergymen in unmanageable parishes have, to press the outward services of religion on those who lead unworthy and immoral lives. The nearer the evil is brought to himself the more does he shrink from realizing it; especially if he have, with Mr. Gladstone, a keen perception of the exceeding sinfulness of the State's disavowing the Church, if he feel that such a step must be, sooner or later<sup>p</sup>, ruin to the offending party. A public man who reads his Bible can never overlook the awful sanction which attends on his country's relation to the Church: "*The nation and kingdom which will not serve thee shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.*" It is not in human nature but that he should hide his eyes from the fearful conviction that this sentence is virtually passed on the State and Country in whose service he is himself engaged. He will go on in hope, believing against hope, after others at a greater distance have seen clearly that the time for hope is over. In his zeal to avert that final revolt, which he knows must decide the doom of his nation, he will be instinctively disposed to think too slightly of the sacrifice of principle likely to be involved in the successive accommodations which

<sup>p</sup> *Sooner or later*; and therefore the case of the United States, or of much older countries, which have refused to obey the Church, is no objection to the argument—We see not yet what will come of it.

may be proposed to the Church: not perceiving that the sentence has gone forth already, the nation and kingdom *has* refused to serve the Church, when it has once forced on the Church terms which amount to a renunciation of her fundamental rules. Her giving way in such a case can do no good to the nation, nay, rather harm, as encouraging it in ill, and lessening its chance of coming to a better mind; and it will include the Church herself in the ruin. Natural, then, as it may be to do so, yet we must not hide our eyes from the fact, that better had the country be ruined than the Church apostatize; or rather, better had the first fall alone than drag down the other with it.

The best way perhaps to realize the drift of this is, to put a strong case, such an one as nobody would hesitate in, and then observe how less flagrant cases may insensibly work up to it, and come in the end to the same mischief. Imagine a State, then, in which Liberal principles prevailed, deferring so far to the outcry against supposed human tests, as to make it a condition of the alliance, that the Church should abstain from the use of all the Creeds. This, we take it for granted, would amount, in Mr. Gladstone's view, to a *casus fœderis*. And yet a great many human probabilities might be alleged, unanswerable in their kind, to justify continuing in the alliance, even at that sacrifice. Morality, and faith too, it might be plausibly argued, would be more advanced in the country by the *general* diffusion of the Scriptures and the Sacraments alone, than by their *partial* adoption, under the national sanction, with the safeguard of a pure Creed, by those only whom a voluntary system could reach. But no such reasoning would avail with a person trained in the school of the Church. He would be aware that Catholic tradition in fundamentals is divine, and may not be dispensed with for any human views of spiritual expediency.

Imagine next a less startling case: that instead of omitting all the Creeds, we are required to part with all except the Apostles'. Here the student of antiquity, being aware of the irresistible claim of the Nicene Creed to be esteemed a portion of the Apostolical tradition, and not knowing how near the silencing the voice of such a council may come to

rejecting a part of God's own Word, will probably feel little more hesitation than before; but we should not wonder if some of those who venerate tradition and the Church in general, but have not had leisure to examine details, began, even at this point, to waver; and still more would they do so at the next, when the question rose about the Creed of St. Athanasius; as is too plainly shewn by the example of the American Church in her formularies, and, as we fear, too generally by that of our own Church, nay, and of the Scottish Church, in their practice. We consider these as cases in point, because, we apprehend, there can be no doubt that the concessions in question are accommodations to the mind of the laity, and represent so far a kind of State influence.

Now, even by these few imaginary examples, it seems to us not obscure, that the Conservative tendencies of the very best public men require to be watched, in this matter of the conditions of an Establishment, by persons more exclusively concerned for the spiritual integrity of the Church.

We observe, what greatly confirms us in this idea, that even the high-minded writer before us has not been quite able to keep his language clear of a certain utilitarian tone; we mean not utilitarian in any low or offensive sense, but simply as denoting somewhat too much of regard to intelligible and visible results in our estimate of a system, the purposes whereof we are confessedly so very ignorant of. Thus he writes:—

“Her end is ‘the greatest holiness of the greatest number.’ Her inanimate machinery has no capability of pleasure and pain; has no interests in any intelligible sense. Her living members have all one and the same interest: the aggregate of that interest constitutes the interest of the Church, and it is the production, not of the greatest possible excitement connected with religion, nor of the greatest possible enjoyment connected with religion, nor of the greatest possible appearance of religion; nay, not even the greatest possible quantity of actual religion, at any time or place; but the greatest possible permanent and substantial amount of religion within that sphere over which its means of operation

extend. By religion we would be understood to mean conformity to the will of God<sup>q</sup>."

And again,—

"Nothing can stand against the proof (if proof could be given) that the diminished amount or deteriorated quality of personal religion is the result of that alliance, which we have affirmed to be not less grounded on the nature and truth of things, than affirmed by the general suffrage of mankind<sup>r</sup>."

Again, he argues for the Presbyterianism of Scotland, that "we have seen it by a long experience to be not without the blessing of God, and operative for good on human character<sup>s</sup>." May it be said without offence, that sentences of this cast need always to be guarded by the recollection what inadequate judges we are, either of the manifold ends of the Redeemer's kingdom, or of the degree in which "the greatest holiness of the greatest number," which is but one of them, is affected by any particular measure or system? On this subject all, and especially all who are in a position to influence others extensively, would do well to study Bishop Butler's admirable sermon, "*The Gospel a Witness to all Nations*." It would help them to bear in mind the awful truth, that "the purposes of Providence are carried on by the preaching of the Gospel to those who reject it, as well as to those who receive it." "Thou shalt speak My words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear; for they are most rebellious." It is evident that sayings such as these point to a very different standard of the proceedings of the witnesses of the Gospel, from the actual degree in which mankind are seen to benefit by them; and that the latter rule will require in practice to be continually checked by the former.

One thing we may be quite sure of: that what God clearly wills, that must in the end be expedient, whether we ever come to discern it or no: and thus it is, that discerning in His word clear indications of His will that the Church should be in a certain sense politically established, we should acquiesce in *such* an Establishment, though our human and outward experience led us to anticipate more harm than

<sup>q</sup> Chap. iii. 23.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. iii. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. vi. 75.

good at the result of it; and on the other hand, whatever degree of holiness any given arrangement might seem to produce, we could not acquiesce in it, if clearly opposed to the revealed canon on such matters.

Now the life of a statesman must of necessity be spent very much in calculations of expediency, and in measuring things by their visible results: and the habit of thought so generated may sometimes be unfavourable to that particular exercise of faith, the necessity of which in all Church questions we have now tried to point out; and especially when he has been used to dwell affectionately and thankfully upon the real good results which he can discern. He might be willing to hazard himself, but he fears to hazard others, to hazard even their spiritual interests, upon pure adherence to some portion of God's will, the practical tendency whereof is not perhaps apparent. To make such a venture on a large scale, maturely, wisely, resolutely, charitably, may, for aught we know, be one of the highest acts here on earth of a pure and saintly faith; it may require a completer Church education than this age can anywhere supply: yet it may do us all good to recollect that there has been once an Athanasius who "stood against the world and prevailed;" and that he did so, chiefly by disregarding results when revealed rules and principles were at stake.

But in addition to this scarcely avoidable effect of public life as such, there is a certain personal feeling,—may we be excused for hinting at it?—which we fancy we can discern in that class of statesmen whose views, generally speaking, we suppose to be embodied in this book: which cannot but unconsciously bias their reasonings on doubtful matters discussed in it. It is natural they should be impressed, as public men, with a deep sense of the desecration of their calling, which they apprehend must follow, should ever the service of the State in this country be authoritatively and formally separated from that of the Church. As it is, there is probably enough, and more than enough, to disgust them and make them fear contamination, in the wear and tear of parliamentary and official life: and when the mitigating circumstances are withdrawn; when no blessing from

the Church shall precede the daily labours of the Houses of Parliament; when no holidays, perhaps no Sundays, shall be recognised, except on profane and secular grounds; when the notion of doing anything for the Church shall have become as obsolete as is now the notion of confining high office to Churchmen; when, above all, they have no longer to accompany them in their most irksome and unsatisfactory toils, the consciousness that all is but part of the price of the continuance of so great a blessing as the presence of the Church in all parts of the realm: then, indeed, we may well believe that their calling may seem perfectly intolerable, their occupation quite gone: while yet in withdrawing from it, the dreary thought will accompany them, that they are giving up their country altogether, and leaving it without hope in the hands of the anti-Christian party. Instinctive anticipations of this kind may well render persons slow—we will not say to allow the separation of Church and State, but to admit the fact of such separation, after it has virtually taken place; and certainly it does seem almost like asking too much, even of the most devoted children and servants of the Church, to urge on them the continuance of their thankless toil, even in such an extreme case; yet we know the illustrious Scripture examples, of persons who served in the courts of heathen monarchs, with an eye throughout, assuredly, to the welfare of God's people, and were rewarded beyond all personal advancement, by being made instruments of the greatest deliverances to Israel.

But it may be said, Joseph and Daniel condescended to minister, not to apostate, but merely to heathen princes: and there was not the same scandal in belonging to their courts, as in persevering to act under a polity which was Christian and has ceased to be so. We reply, even under Ahab, Obadiah, who "feared the Lord greatly," continued to be over the king's household: nor do we find in the times immediately before the captivity, that the prophets and others, whose personal obedience was unsullied, declined to act under or to counsel the fallen kings of Judah. And as the Christians of the three first centuries were willing to serve in the Pagan courts and armies, only, of course, keeping

themselves from all communication with idolatry ; so we read not that those of the fourth counted it unlawful to hold civil or military commissions from Constantius, Julian, or Valens, apostates as they were. Undoubtedly the condition will be a most undesirable one, but we can conceive it undertaken and borne in the spirit of a confessor, and bringing with it a great reward.

Or if things should become too bad even for this ; if such a state (no unlikely proceeding) should even go on to exclude from her councils the attached members of the Church, imposing, e.g. such a test, under plea of guarding against intolerance, as would amount to disavowal of any exclusive system : then, indeed, the State must be given up, and it would be impossible for a good Christian to serve it ; but no reason whatever to despair of the temporal fortunes of the Kingdom of Heaven : then would the manly and dutiful minds, who now least endure the thought of separation, be driven perforce into the direct and avowed service of the Church alone ; and who can tell what great results it might please the Almighty to bring about by such a concentration of the noblest energies in the one high and self-denying cause ? For aught we know, if human haste and restlessness mar not His gracious purpose, He may have in store for us, by means such as these, a conversion, not of barbarous heathens, but more wonderful yet, of civilized and lapsed Christians, which may once again change the whole face of Christendom as completely as that which ensued on the downfall of the Roman Empire. At all events, the last thing which those who would serve Him in faith need fear, is being left out of His ranks, having their place on earth entirely unhallowed. Each day of their trial, as it brings its own task, will bring also its light to shew and its strength to bear that task : and the more they can use themselves to walk by this simple faith, instead of always weighing and measuring visible events, the more competent will they prove to judge correctly of the difficult questions which arise out of the relation of Church and State. As it is, we have to allow for the effect both of their habits of calculation and of such natural misgivings as we have been describing, and therefore may

with less presumption question the full accuracy of some of their views.

We have observed already that the plan of Mr. Gladstone's work did not allow him to dwell much on the Scriptural part of the argument, which is the more to be regretted, as all modern views on the subject, and his own among the rest, have the disadvantage of an *ex post facto* law: it is too manifest that they are constructed with an eye to particular cases, and thus they often fail in procuring conviction, even where little or nothing can be said against their truth. The theories, for example, of Hooker, Warburton, Chalmers, perhaps also those of the Ultramontane Romanists, are each in turn so nicely adapted to the very state of things in which the writers found themselves placed, that we feel as we examine them somewhat of the same kind of suspicion as when a disputed will or other document coincides too exactly with the interests of the witnesses who produce it. If a theory can be found antecedent to all experience, it will, by its very date, be free from surmises of this sort; and as we have hinted, such a theory is found in Scripture. It is contained in Isaiah's analogy of the nursing fathers and nursing mothers; which according to the ineffable fulness of Scripture, will be found in its brevity and simplicity (would men only work it out in good faith), equivalent to a whole code of canon laws for the adjustment of relations often found so intricate.

Some perhaps will think it strange to be referred thus to the Old Testament, and to a single text there, for an evangelical law of such great practical import. But they may consider that since it was not intended that the Church should, at her first beginning, enter into relations with any State, since that whole order of things was to be but a later development of something in her original constitution, any rules expressly concerning it could only be prophetic, and the natural place to look for them would be in those portions of the prophetic Scriptures which the Church, from the beginning, knew to have reference to her own later times. Nor would it be hard to find other usages and rules on which the same remark might be made, viz. that they are

developments of something in the original system, for which at first there was no occasion, and accordingly that for the Scriptural sanctions of them we have to look in the prophetic and typical Scriptures rather than in the New Testament itself. Such for example is the penitential discipline of the Church; her earlier and purer times had comparatively little occasion for it; and when it became settled, it was in great measure the development of precedents and hints from the Jewish history, and the lessons of mortification and penitence in the Psalms and Prophets. Such again is the splendour of churches and church ornaments: the days of our first poverty of course knew it not, but when it came, it found its warrant in the records of Moses, David, and Solomon. No prejudice, therefore, need lie against a similar mode of deducing the obligation of the State to establish the Church.

If any one ask of what particular article or fundamental rule of God's kingdom this theory of Church and State is a development, we should answer, of the Holy Catholic Church, i.e. of the continued presence and manifestation of Jesus Christ in the world, through the medium of that society which is called His mystical body. The Church is the spouse of Christ, and the mother of His family; and these passages of Isaiah declare what is the especial office of kings and queens in that family, how they in particular stand related to the Church. They are to be her nursing fathers and mothers; i.e. as Leslie has explained at large, (and to him we must refer for a thorough and most satisfactory elucidation of the passages), they are among her servants and attendants, trusted by Almighty God with the nourishment of her children, with the training of them, and bearing them safe in their arms. The phrase has acquired a trite and almost a proverbial use, in a very different sense: as though the Church were a helpless infant in the arms of some Defender of the Faith; but the context puts the true force of the image out of question: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will lift up Mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up My standard to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their

shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord; for they shall not be ashamed that wait for Me<sup>t</sup>." Again<sup>u</sup>: "Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters *shall be nursed at thy side.*" If in another verse we find, "Thou shalt *suck the milk of the Gentiles, and thou shalt suck the breast of kings;*" this cannot be so pressed as to denote childish dependence and obedience, since in the very same prophecy, as well as in the former one, apparently parallel to it, the expressions of humiliation, nay subjection to the Church, on the part of the potentates of the earth, are so very full and unequivocal: "The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and *their kings shall minister unto thee.*" "Thy gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: yea those nations shall be utterly wasted.*" These words throw light on one of the distinctive titles given to Jesus Christ in the Apocalypse: "Prince of the kings of the earth:" they point out in what sense the *kingdoms of this world* were to become the *kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ*; and how "the kings of this world" were to bring their "honour and glory into the holy Jerusalem." And that all this was not so much a prediction as a promulgation of God's will on the subject, is proved unquestionably by the fearful sanction annexed: perishing and utter wasting to the nation and kingdom that will not serve Zion.

Thus are kings and governors representatives of Jesus Christ, in His protecting particular Providence, whereby He educates those who shall be heirs of salvation; that Providence of which Moses, who "was king in Jeshurun," was a type, when he had to bear God's people, "as a nursing father beareth a sucking child," which he describes in its application to the whole people, where he says, "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting

<sup>t</sup> Isa. xlix, 22, 23.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. lx, 4.

arms:" and in its application to Benjamin individually (i.e. to the energetic self-renouncing champions of the Church, such as St. Paul, of whom Benjamin was the appointed image), in the last clause of that highly-descriptive verse, "The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety, by (literally, *upon*) Him, and the Lord shall cover, wrap him up in His garment, and he shall dwell between His shoulders." There cannot be an exacter—if it were uninspired we should add—a sweeter and more engaging description of a foster-father bearing a young child; and this, we have reason to believe, is the appropriate Scriptural image, the sacramental sign, as antiquity would have esteemed it, of the care due from kings and governors to the children of the Church <sup>x</sup>.

We will not give way to the thoughts which instinctively arise, on comparing such a description with certain late proceedings in the matter of Christian education: it is pleasanter and better to turn back the mind's eye towards the days when the kings and rulers of the world first began to appreciate this highest part of their calling. St. Paul had taught Christians, from the first, that even heathen princes were *leitourγοὶ*, "ministers of God to His people for good;" and when they came themselves to be Christians, it never entered their minds that the true and eternal good was the one interest of their people with which they were never to busy themselves; on the contrary, the very word *leitουργός* suggested to them, as the word "minister" naturally might to us, the notion of their being, though of course not literally as priests, yet in some analogous way, called to wait on God in His Church; and the prophet's word, "nursing fathers," would at once inform them what that office was. They would well understand that in spiritual matters they were to execute the laws of Christ's Church, not impose laws upon her; except it be the office of a nurse to give directions to a parent, and not rather receive instructions how the child ought to be managed. The strength of this impression on their minds will account for such anecdotes as that of Constantine refusing to take his seat at the Council of Nice until he was requested by the bishops to do so; and again declining to receive an

<sup>x</sup> Deut. xxxiii. 5; Numb. xi. 12; Deut. xxxiii. 27, 12.

appeal when tendered by Donatists in an ecclesiastical cause; and also for that remarkable expression, so different from the tone encouraged by the modern doctrine of legal supremacy, in his promulgation of the Nicene decrees: "By the suggestion of God, I called together to Nice the greater part of the bishops, with whom, *as one of you, I your fellow-servant*," the fellow-servant of ordinary laymen, "*and rejoicing above measure so to be*, did myself undertake the task of examining the truth." These and the other incidents of the same era, commonly appealed to by writers on this subject: such as Hosius<sup>y</sup> and St. Hilary's demurring to the sentence of Constantius; St. Ambrose's resistance to Valentinian and his officers and excommunication of Theodosius; St. Basil's refusal to alter the Church formularies, though it might bring Valens into Church communion; and still more than the incidents themselves, the manner in which such sacerdotal boldness was received by the several emperors, and the tone in which it is related by contemporary writers, (some of them of the highest authority, St. Athanasius, for instance, and St. Gregory Nazianzen,) are sufficient indications, not perhaps of any formal compact, such as some appear to dream of, between the ecclesiastical and secular authorities, but of something yet more striking and authoritative; a general consent in the early Christian world, as to the meaning of what Scripture teaches concerning the office of kings in the Church. The notion of nursing fathers—confidential servants entrusted to bring up her children according to her laws—runs through the whole, and accounts for each particular. The voice of the Church was, "we call Christian emperors happy, if they make their power a handmaid to the majesty of God, for no purpose so much as the propagation of His true religion and worship<sup>z</sup>." And again: "Whereas it is written, *The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee*: it may be that by kings he means here literally those who are crowned

<sup>y</sup> S. Athanas., Hist. Arian. ad Monach., c. 44; S. Hilar. ad Constant., i. 1; S. Ambros. ad Valentinian., Ep. 21; ad Eugen., Ep. 57; ad Theodos., Ep. 51; . Greg. Naz., Hom. 20, al. 48, ss. 48—51.

<sup>z</sup> S. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, v. 24.

with the highest honours, and sway the sceptre of royalty, who also are ministers (*παρέστησαν*) of the Church; *now ministering in this place signifies obedience*<sup>a</sup>." The whole doctrine was, and we believe still is, significantly taught in many parts of the Christian world, by the custom which prevails of the sovereign at solemn coronations wearing a deacon's habit, or part of it, under his robes of state; thereby acknowledging himself a servant of the Church, whose anointing and blessing he has just received, and bound to wait on and guard her bishops and priests, somewhat as a deacon should, in their holy offices; and again (which is another part of the diaconate), to take care that the Church's children generally be duly taught, and warned of their own part in the service.

Let us now try by this notion of a nurse's duty certain particulars in our own Church establishment. It is a test which requires no very complex discussion; plain men, even unlearned ones, are in a great measure competent to apply it; and should it unfortunately happen that we are on some matters conducted to a less favourable point of view, by our Scriptural argument, than Mr. Gladstone, by his more philosophical and elaborate one, it will be some compensation for the annoyance, if we come to see at all distinctly what are the points in the Church polity of our country, for the amendment of which, if we cannot or must not strive, we may at least humble ourselves and pray—an alternative sometimes perhaps left too much out of sight, when people are descanting on the unpractical nature of such discussions, and the uselessness of dwelling on grievances which one cannot redress.

The matters, then, which occur to us as likely to be materially modified in our view by the application of this test, are the obvious ones of our Church's *nationality*, as affecting its *Catholic character*; the *legislative power*, as at present exercised, we fear we must say not *by*, but *over* it; and its condition in respect of *discipline*. In compliance with the order of Mr. Gladstone's argument we will take the last of the three first.

<sup>a</sup> St. Cyril of Alex. *in loc.*

One would think, if there were any part of a nursing father's duty, in which he was bound more than in another to look strictly to the wishes and directions of the parent, it would be the moral training of the child,—all that bears on reward or punishment. Any obstruction here to the paternal will would appear an especially flagrant dereliction of duty. Now is it not notorious, that the ancient discipline of the Church is at present in abeyance in this country ; that the reason commonly assigned for this is the interference of the laws of the land, which, under pretence of certain civil results of excommunication, virtually wrest the command of the keys of God's kingdom out of those hands to which our Lord committed them ; and that this state of things is contrary, not only to the rule and order of the ancient Church, but to the declared will and desire of the present, which enjoins all her ministers annually and solemnly to declare, that "the restoration of the said discipline is much to be wished?"—a sufficiently distinct intimation, surely, on the part of the parent, in what the nursing mother's duty consists. And yet what but the reluctance of the State hinders the accomplishment of this earnest wish ? What other will but hers can possibly stand in the Church's way, and thwart her desire, so emphatically and unequivocally expressed ? For as to mere popular feeling, however necessary to be consulted when State purposes are taken into account, it is not to be supposed that the Church, left to herself, would allow any such consideration to avail against the plain institution of Christ, recognised by herself in all ages.

But if any one really doubt the mind of the State on this subject, let him only put the case to himself of an unpromising revival of discipline in any diocese. Is it not quite certain, that if the present Statute Book were found insufficient, new and more stringent measures would presently be invented to check such an effort of priestcraft and intrusion on liberty ?

We are not, however, without our fears, that what we are now deprecating may seem to Mr. Gladstone one of the felicitous results of our present position ; at least, there are in his third chapter many expressions which at first sight

appear somewhat at variance with the wish recorded in the Communion Service :—

“Certainly her faithful members must be content to stand side by side with many who care little for religion ; but the promises of Christ may secure them from the danger of contagion ; and they may also acquire from their position a livelier remembrance of that lesson, that we may not say one to another, ‘Stand by, for I am holier than thou.’ I say, the promises of Christ ; for the Establishment does but fulfil His prophetic declarations, in not attempting any universal separation of the tares from the wheat ; of the good fish from the bad ; content with the laws of her mixed condition upon earth, emulous of the example of her Lord, who ate with publicans and sinners, and generous as her heavenly Father, who sends rain and light upon the just and the unjust, rendering benefit, but not therefore receiving pollution<sup>b</sup>.”

And again :—

“We do not anticipate any evil from that contact which may occur in the discharge of duty ; and there is in view the animating prospect of thus arousing many a dormant spirit unto holiness, and rescuing many a tender lamb of the Redeemer from the fangs of the roaring lion<sup>c</sup>.”

Yet once more :—

“We are prepared, then, to assert it generally of a national Church, that it brings human and secondary motives to bear upon mankind in favour of religion, with a power greater than that which would belong to it, *cæteris paribus*, when unestablished, because ordinarily it would not occupy the same station in public estimation. The fashion which might, in a wealthy and luxurious country, choose to reject attendance at church, is enlisted in its favour. A narrow and feeble provision, no doubt ; but we must not despise the day of small things<sup>d</sup>.”

It is not now, be it observed, from abstract views or feelings on the comparative excellence of this or that motive, that we feel inclined to deprecate statements such as these, but we wish it to be well considered how they appear when

<sup>b</sup> Chap. iii. 26.

<sup>c</sup> § 29.

<sup>d</sup> § 33.

placed side by side with certain clear injunctions of our Saviour, as explained by the recorded practice of the Apostles. For example, when we read, among the recommendations of an Establishment, that "the fashion which might, in a wealthy and luxurious country, choose to reject attendance at church, is enlisted in its favour," it occurs whether there be not some little forgetfulness of the caution against "casting pearls before swine." And how would it sound to say, "Her faithful members must be content to stand side by side with many who care little for religion?" immediately after the reading of the Apostolical Canon<sup>e</sup>, "I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat."

We are, we confess, a little jealous of the seeming accordance of some of Mr. Gladstone's arguments on this part of his subject with the opinions attributed to the late Mr. Knox, who is reported to have maintained "that the want of discipline so much complained of was one of the happy features of our Establishment<sup>f</sup>," and to have praised it for diffusing universally a low form of religion. Mr. Knox's authority was deservedly great on many points, but in matters where primitive antiquity has a right to be paramount, we can hardly consider him a safe guide, considering that he openly avows a sort of Eclecticism, quite inconsistent with implicit submission to the holy Catholic Church. "Being bound to nothing," he says<sup>g</sup>, "I seem to myself to have access to the spirit of everything. Let it not appear arrogant in me simply to say, that it is as if I saw from a high ground variously fenced-in paths in a valley below, where safety is secured, and guidance obtained, at the expense of confinement and coercion in various ways: in all which Divine Providence seems most wisely to have consulted the diversified exigencies of weak mortals. . . Now, among these fenced-in paths, that formed by John Wesley interests me peculiarly," &c.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. v. 11.      <sup>f</sup> Introd. to "Burnet's Lives and Characters," edited by Bp. Jebb, pp. xxxiv., xxxv.      <sup>g</sup> "Remains," vol. i. 74.

It is no wonder that with this sort of notion, looking on the road of primitive Christianity as only one among many which led in their time and order to the same point, Mr. Knox should have felt himself free to rejoice, as things are, in the cessation of all Church discipline. But Mr. Gladstone has other thoughts of antiquity. Since, however, some of his phraseology may appear to countenance the lax opinion alluded to, it may be well to point out that his own argument in defence of an Establishment does by no means involve any necessity for depriving that Establishment of discipline. He says, in effect, "We must have some security for the truth being presented to all, even to those who will profit but little by it; and to secure this, which an Establishment does, we must be content to have all sorts of people included in the visible Church." Granted; but it does not follow that all should stand side by side in that Church. To be a subject of excommunication, a man must be of the Church; and excommunication itself, as Hooker has observed, does not so entirely shut a person out as that he shall be thenceforth excluded from the influence of the body. We may be within or around the Holy Place, though the stations of the penitents, as compared with the communicants, and of the various orders of the penitents one among another, be ever so religiously observed. It was so in the time of St. Austin and St. Chrysostom; it is, or was so, to a considerable extent, of later years, in the Kirk of Scotland; yet in both cases the system had the countenance of the State. National Establishments, therefore, need not exclude discipline; and if ours do so the fault must be somewhere else, and not in the mere circumstance of its nationality.

At the same time we cannot but apprehend, indeed Mr. Gladstone himself seems to be aware, that there is no knowing how much of the alleged effect of the Establishment in bringing home the Church to every one, may, in fact, be due to the catholicity of the Church. All that is said about not neglecting any, evidently belongs to her as well when separate as established: her discipline, in one sense so exclusive, is in another the most comprehensive possible; the difference to her, therefore, between separation and establishment

is reduced to considerations merely temporal: protection, countenance, pecuniary resources; which to reject, as long as they can be innocently accepted, would of course be abusing a talent and incurring a judgment; but when the question lies between such things on the one hand, and but a probable breach of God's commands, or maiming of His work, on the other, to state what would be the choice of faith, seems a mere truism in Christian casuistry, such as one is almost ashamed to have to set down in words. The Lord's hand is not so shortened.

And on this subject we cannot but regret to find high authority lending itself to the common, but, as we think, gratuitous assertion, that—

“Christianity arrived at the summits of society by the miraculous impulses of its original propagation, whose vibrations had been measured, no doubt, with reference to the space they were to traverse, and did not exhaust themselves till they had reached the farthest point to which they were destined<sup>b</sup>.”

Where, we would ask, is the warrant for this saying? What Scripture, what Catholic tradition, enables us so to sound the exact depth of the cloud of glorious promises which envelopes the Church? The prophetic word is, “*your iniquities* have separated between you and your God, and *your sins* have hid His face from you, that He will not hear.” Let this barrier be removed, let the spirit of martyrdom, the power of Christian self-denial, leaven the whole Church as in the first days; and it is according to God's graciousness, and the wording of His promises, to believe that such miraculous aid as may be needful for her, thoroughly fulfilling her office of witness, will not be withheld from her; whether established, as in Augustine's time, or persecuted, as in Cyprian's, “her sound will go out into all lands, and her words unto the ends of the world;” and in every town in every land, all that pass along the streets will hear by her the voice of Wisdom, and, listen they or forbear, will know that there hath been a prophet among them.

But observe how closely her hope of success in either state

<sup>b</sup> Chap. ii. § 40.

is connected with our denying ourselves, and embracing the Cross. Over and above all mysterious ways, in which, for aught we know, such causes may work such effects, a glance only at the machinery by which she actually prevailed in former days, is sufficient to shew this. When open persecution and martyrdom ceased, voluntary poverty, retirement, and mortification, "the philosophy of the solitaires," as St. Chrysostom delights to call it, which had flourished all along, but had been comparatively obscured by the glories of actual warfare, were brought forward in their power: and by them, it should seem, as much at least as by any direct imperial aid, were the truths and duties of orthodox Christianity propagated amongst the "dense masses" of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and other such cities. As if on purpose to draw men's attention to this, it was they, the solitaires, whose faithful warnings and sufferings, under the direction of such champions as Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, kept the stream of piety clear among the body of the people, through more than one heretical and persecuting reign. Nor shall we have any right to despair of the full declaration of the Gospel by the Church to every creature in the vast wildernesses of London and our own manufacturing districts, until a like experiment shall have been tried here, with or without State countenance, and shall have proved ineffectual.

But the voluntary method, it is argued, brings the Church into a worse dependence than that on the State; "it tends to give a preponderating influence, in determining the doctrine which shall be taught to the less qualified class<sup>1</sup>;" and therefore is ill fitted to ensure either permanency of sound doctrine, or acceptance of discipline, which must be often unpalatable.

We ask *which* voluntary method? For this matter is often unfairly argued, as if in the nature of things and the experience of the Church, no other could be found than that which prevails among most of our dissenters, Romish as well as Protestant; the method, namely, of making collections for each teacher among his own flock; whereas it

<sup>1</sup> Chap. iii. 44.

is well known that the system of the early Church, voluntary as of course it was, threw no such snare in the way of individual ministers, inasmuch as the whole oblations of the faithful were cast into one sum, whereof the bishop was steward, and at his discretion the portions of the several priests and other ministers were assigned monthly<sup>k</sup>.

In our own times, the Churches in Canada and elsewhere, so far as they are supported by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and also the Wesleyan Methodists, may be cited as exemplifying (more or less imperfectly, it is true,) this ancient arrangement; so ancient, that we may without much hesitation refer its origin to the Mother Church of all Christendom, and to the Apostles' distribution of the gifts which were laid in such abundance at their feet.

But, it may be said, even this method affords but incomplete protection. It exempts, indeed, each particular minister from suffering in his estate by the caprice or personal feeling of his flock; but it leaves the Church, as a body, subject to the shifting taste of the community, and what may be called the spirit of the times: whereas the terms of an ecclesiastical endowment, once fixed by law, are comparatively permanent. And, undoubtedly, *cæteris paribus*, such endowment is desirable: but supposing it to fail, through no fault of the Church, there yet remains a resource for the independence of her ministers, and consequent permanency of her doctrine; one which Mr. Gladstone himself has incidentally referred to. He asks, "Who does not see that the Apostle himself, in writing to his converts that he has laboured for his own support, because he would not be chargeable unto any of them, affords an express recognition of that truth for which we here contend? namely, that when the Christian flock are placed habitually in the position of pay-masters, notions of pride and self-sufficiency will infallibly associate themselves with that function, and men will claim the right to determine upon the doctrine, for whose inculcation they are continually reminded that they supply the pecuniary means<sup>l</sup>?"

<sup>k</sup> See Bingham, bk. v. chap. iv. §§ 2, 3; and St. Cyprian, as quoted by him.

<sup>l</sup> Chap. iii. 43.

The statement, by the way, is perhaps a little too strong: if the pride and self-sufficiency spoken of were "infallible" results of the ancient voluntary system, St. Paul would scarce have sanctioned it so cordially as he did in the case of the Churches of Macedonia; and he would have said more than he has done, by way of recommending his own more common practice to the imitation of bishops and priests in general. But however, he clearly indicates a resource, supposing both endowment and voluntary bounty clogged with conditions, virtual or express, such as Christ's servants could not accept. They may *labour, working with their own hands*; nor need this be any degradation or disparagement to the ministry, provided, what is all along supposed, that the ancient discipline were kept up, to meet this among other emergencies, for which it was at the beginning adopted. And as to the continuance of good learning among the clergy; there have been before now fraternities of devoted persons, not only maintaining themselves in that way, but earning so much over and above, as enabled some of them at least to find leisure both for their own studies, and for the training of candidates for the ministry.

This, it will be said, is all Utopian; but it is surely within the limits of possibility, and it is enough for our present purpose, if the resource we point out be as likely to succeed, as the need for it to arise: that need being, as we have seen, the failure of endowments and the refusal of voluntary aid, except on base conditions.

One word more on the question of Discipline, from which we have too far digressed: it will have been seen that Mr. Gladstone<sup>m</sup> quotes some of our Lord's parables, such as that of the Tares, and of the Net cast into the sea; and also the example of our Lord in eating with publicans and sinners; the dispensation also of Almighty God, in sending rain on the just and on the unjust; and the evil mark set on those who say, "Stand off, for I am holier than thou." Here we seem again to perceive the sinister influence of Mr. Knox's reasonings, for these are the very texts which persons of his way of thinking are apt to allege against all discipline whatsoever.

But whether they have any such force may well be

doubted: considering, first of all, that they cannot mean anything inconsistent with the other and plainer texts, which have been already produced in favour of discipline, and with the practice of the Church ensuing. No reason can be given why the Parable of the Tares, for example, should be understood as prohibiting the separation wished for by our Church, which will not make out that it equally tells against all separation from notorious sinners, and therefore against St. Paul's canon, "With such an one no not to eat." Nor do we see that such an interpretation of it can be anyhow reconciled with the authoritative words, "Whose sins ye retain, they are retained." "Retaining of sins" can hardly be imagined without some sort of visible distinction, such as shall prevent persons lying under that sentence from standing exactly "side by side" with those whose sins are remitted. We must therefore look out for some other interpretation, and we have not far to seek; the early expositors will teach us with one voice that this portion of the parable is directed, not against that "godly discipline" concerning which the Church prays continually with Bishop Wilson that it may be "restored and countenanced," but against that impatient feeling, so natural even to the best of uninstructed men, which would lead them, as St. Cyprian, alluding to this parable, expresses it<sup>n</sup>, "to claim to themselves what the Father hath reserved to the Son, to imagine themselves already capable of taking fan in hand and purging the floor, or of separating all the tares from the wheat, by their human judgment," an error which uncorrected tends either to schism or persecution; and accordingly, as St. Augustin made large use of this parable against the Puritanism, if so one may describe it, of the Donatists; so St. Chrysostom<sup>o</sup> distinctly explains it as forbidding to persecute heretics, yet leaving full power to correct them in the way of discipline: "By the saying, Lest you root up also the wheat with them, what else can He mean but this: that if you were to take arms and slaughter the heretics, many of the Saints too must of necessity fall with them; or that of the tares themselves, many in all likelihood will change and become wheat? You see, then, if you are too hasty in uprooting,

<sup>n</sup> Ep. 54, ed. Fell.

<sup>o</sup> In loco.

you damage that which is to be wheat, destroying those who may perchance alter and improve. The checking then of heretics, and stopping their mouths, the depriving them of power to speak openly, and dissolving their assemblies and leagues, He forbids not, but the killing and slaughtering them." St. Chrysostom points out, it will be perceived, a significant circumstance in the parable, of itself sufficient to keep us from applying it to check discipline, viz. the reason alleged for not then gathering the tares, "lest ye root up also the wheat with them;" "you are not yet competent judges which is or will be wheat, and which are mere tares;" whereas all men surely are competent judges, whether or no their neighbour is openly living in any of those ways which St. Paul says should exclude him from our company.

With regard both to this parable and to the other cited by Mr. Gladstone, of the good fish not to be separated from the bad, is there not some appearance of a confusion between precept, rightly so called, and prophecy? Our Lord says, the good and the bad must go on together for a time, but He does not say that it was His work or will, any further than as He permits it; any otherwise than as when He says, that the love of the greater part must wax cold, and that there must be false Christs and false prophets. As one would not call the fulfilment of such prophecies "His clear intentions," so it may be questioned whether the term be strictly accurate, applied to His intimations of the mixed condition of the Church. It is a serious matter, many times, to confound prediction with precept, and it seems therefore right to note every seeming instance of it. Consider the passage in the 18th of St. Matthew, one of the most peremptory, perhaps, of those intimations: "It is impossible but that τὰ σκάνδαλα, the offences foretold, should come." If our Saviour had stopped there, this also, we suppose, would have been quoted as tending to forbid any judicial strictness in the administration of the Kingdom of Heaven; but it is followed up (and the fact is remarkable) not only by a general "woe" against all by whom the offences come, but also by distinct provisions for the enforcement of that very discipline, which such warnings are supposed to forbid,

ending with, "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

The case is different, when, as in the prophecy on which we have been dwelling so much, of the Nursing Fathers, a sanction is annexed, namely, in the verse, "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted:" or when from the tone of the prophecy itself, or by comparison with other passages, or in any other way, the Divine approbation is intimated, though but doubtfully.

The mention of the Almighty sending rain upon the just and unjust, and of our Lord Himself eating with publicans and sinners, is not surely much in point, unless it can be shewn that granting some benefits necessarily implies reserving none; and that our Lord was in the same relation to those with whom He so condescended as ordinary Christians to an excommunicated person. Observe, too, that in the very wording of the law of excommunication the terms "heathen man and publican" are introduced, as if to remind men of these passages, supposed by some inconsistent with that practice, and so to evince that part of the care and love which is enjoined towards those unhappy persons consists in treating them with due reserve. Again, the state of mind implied in "Stand off, for I am holier than thou," would seem less likely to be encouraged by a regular system of authoritative Church censures, which would prescribe for us whom we ought to withdraw from, than by leaving each person to draw the line for himself.

On the whole, we greatly wish that this part of Mr. Gladstone's argument were so expressed, as to give less encouragement to the enemies of Christian discipline. We fear the use which others may make of his statements. It is too true, that Church censures have been practically long disused among us; yet is it something, that the omission is annually lamented in the Prayer-book, and the system recognised in the theory of the ecclesiastical courts. In the effort which is now making to do away, even in respect of delinquent clergy, this last relic of the power of the keys, we see but the natural result of undue concession to the State

in former times. We know but too well the order of the destructive process. First, when substantial power is to be surrendered, people are reconciled to it by being told, "It is but an arrangement forced on us for the time; you see we keep the old forms and framework entire, and by and by, should circumstances allow, they may be reanimated." Then, as time rolls on, sober and practical men, men well acquainted with the present Church, and too busy to trouble themselves with obsolete observances, begin to ask, "Why retain the shadow when the substance is gone? especially when such scruples are found to stand in the way of real tangible reform." And thus, without deliberate apostacy, we may easily conceive any Church principle whatever completely given up and vanishing from a country in the course of two generations. The reformers of one age contrive to paralyse it, and those of the next think they may as well kill it out of the way. Were such a thing to happen in respect of so sacred a matter as the judicial prerogative of Bishops, it would be a great grief for sincere venerators of the Church, like Mr. Gladstone, to find that they had been unwittingly co-operating in it.

This topic naturally conducts us to the second head, on which, as we think, the excellent author's "wish" has been too clearly "father to his thoughts." How does the present state of the Crown's legislative supremacy in England accord with the prophetic idea of the regal office in the Church? Those who were to sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; those who were sent by our Lord, as His Father sent Him; those without whom St. Ignatius thought nothing ought to be done in the Church; and by whom, according to St. Cyprian, "every act of the Church was to be guided, and that by a Divine law;" are not even allowed to be judges, how many of their own order the necessities of their own Church require. The Irish Church Bill of 1833, to which in particular we refer, has been declared on high authority<sup>p</sup> to be binding on the consciences of Anglican Clergymen, Bishops as well as others, by virtue of the oath

<sup>p</sup> By the late Bishop of Ferns, in his Letter to his Clergy. *Brit Mag.*, v. 742.

taken at ordination, that we will administer “the discipline of Christ as this Church and Realm hath received the same.” That is, it is consistent with the discipline of Christ, as received in this Church and Realm,—it is one of our constitutional laws,—that bishopricks may be suppressed to any extent by the sovereign, at the request of a body of laymen, any number of whom may be heretics, contrary to the express protest of the episcopal body. For let it be well understood, that this is the ground upon which the invalidity of that Bill, as an ecclesiastical law, was maintained at the time by certain Churchmen, viz. the public dissent of those to whom by the law of Jesus Christ, and as they flattered themselves, by the law of the English Church also, an indispensable authority in all such matters was committed. They imagined, therefore, that former unions of dioceses, to which apparently the bishops were consenting, formed no precedent for Lord Stanley’s Bill, in which the same thing was done in spite of their open and solemn protest. It seems we were mistaken: and if the state of parties should at any time make it expedient to carry the same system a little further;—to suppress, for example, the whole episcopate, with the exception of the four Archbishops, or even to leave but one Bishop for each of the islands;—whatever may be said against it on the score of piety or public interest, it would not be contrary to Christ’s discipline as England has received it, and would be binding therefore on all our consciences, though each and all of our spiritual Fathers had lifted his voice ever so loudly against it. They might remonstrate, but if they disobeyed,—if they took measures for continuing but one of the condemned sees,—they would, on this construction, be disloyal before God, and perjured.

When such is the view taken in such high quarters of the actual relation of the Church to the State among us, no wonder if some misgiving arise in those who have learned that the Apostles were to represent Christ in His kingly, as well as his sacerdotal and prophetic offices. They find little resemblance between the attitude of a sovereign and parliament enforcing such laws, and that in which they should be found, if they would fulfil the decree of Him by Whom

kings reign. It seems to them strange that it should be part of a nursing father's prerogative to cast down at will the thrones of those whom the Father has ordained to govern the whole family. In short, they cannot get it out of their minds, that an alliance on such terms involves a great sin; not only on the part of the State enforcing, but also on the part of the Church consenting to it; and they could have wished that the State rather had rebelled alone, by casting off the Church for a time, than that our forefathers had yielded (*if they did really yield*) to an arrangement so plainly contrary to the Word of God.

Nor does it tend greatly to assuage their misgivings, when they reflect on that other obvious instance of encroachment by our nursing fathers, the nomination of the Successors of the Apostles exclusively by the Crown, and enforcement of the same by outlawry, confiscation, and imprisonment. They can understand well enough how Constantius, Julian, or Valens, might desire to force bishops on unwilling electors or consecrators; but they cannot conceive an Ambrose or a Basil heartily allowing the claim, and maintaining it as part of that discipline of Christ which every priest in His Church is pledged to maintain. Our Lord called whom He would, and they came unto Him, to be ordained, and as He was sent, so were His Apostles and their successors: could He mean them to have no voice at all—not even a veto—in the designation of those whom they should consecrate?

But this whole topic has been so fully and elaborately argued, that it is unnecessary to do more than just mention it, as completing the view of the Church's condition in respect of legislative power. First, those from whom alone her spiritual laws should emanate, are nominated by a power which may be, and probably for a long time will be, hostile to her rights: next, not even these are allowed so much as an effective protest on matters the most vital to the due execution of their trust.

But it is said, anomalous as all this sounds, and in some respects even profane, yet the system has worked well, and experience happily answers the objections which theory, ex-

cept by abandoning the principles of the ancient Church, has never yet been able to deal with. This seems to be the ground on which Mr. Gladstone falls back with most confidence.

“The Government of England has ever been distinguished in civil matters less by accuracy of adhesion to any dogmatic and determinate theory than by the skilful use of natural influences, and a general healthiness of tone and harmony of operation, resulting from a happy and providential fusion of elements, rather than from deliberately advised intention. If this has been the case in civil matters; if our constitution, as viewed by the crude speculatist, consist of a mass of anomalies, threatening perpetual contradiction and collision; if it has wrought rather by provision for the avoidance of such evils than for their subsequent remedy; so also it has been with the Church, whose relations with the State had for many years proceeded rather upon a mutually friendly understanding, than upon precise definitions of rights; and therefore we cannot expect to exhibit a theory which will bear throughout a critical analysis, in this more than in any other department of our national Government<sup>9</sup>.”

Most true: no considerate reader of our history but must humbly and thankfully confess that we have been favoured in this, as in other respects, far beyond expectation or desert; yet Mr. Gladstone himself allows that it has all depended on a mutual friendly understanding with the State; and if that be gone, or fast going, the anomalies of course assume a more practical form, and must and will be more thought of than in times of more harmony.

What is more, this answer is irrelevant to the main objection. It is like what is urged in behalf of Presbyterianism in Scotland: “Do you not see how well it all works? It has the blessing of God upon it, and cannot therefore be very wrong.” This is arguing by sight, and not by faith. The punishment, for aught we know, may be only deferred; and perhaps, if we looked calmly and deeply, we should detect, in both cases, evident symptoms of mischief, bearing more or less the aspect of judicial inflictions, penal consequences

<sup>9</sup> Chap. iv. § 15.

o the surrender of the Church's rights. The only sufficient defence of the arrangements in question, would be to reconcile them, or at least make it doubtful whether they could not be reconciled, with Scripture and the voice of the early Universal Church. No reasoning on apparent results can ever answer that purpose.

It is said again, the supremacy of the State "does not destroy the independence of the Church, because there always remains the remedy of putting an end to the connection."

"The alliance, then, is one *durante bene placito* of both the contracting parties. And if the conscience of the Church of England should by its constituted rulers require any law, or any meeting to make laws, as essential to its well-being, and such law, or the licence of such meeting, should be permanently refused, it would then be her duty to resign her civil privileges, and act in her free spiritual capacity: a contingency as improbable, we trust, as it would be deplorable, but one which, opening this extreme remedy, testifies to the real, though dormant and reserved, independence of the Church<sup>r</sup>."

Now we confess ourselves unable to comprehend this line of argument. In the first place, if the English Church is really in such a position with regard to the State, as to have given up, though but for a time, certain inalienable privileges, vested in her by our Lord Himself, which, according to the statement of Bishop Elrington and others, we have reason to think is the case, then is she *pro tanto* in a state of sin, and has reason to feel uneasy and be afraid of God's judgments.

Again, in what sense can it be said that the Church of England retains in her power the remedy of putting an end to the connection? It may be said in the same sense, as we might affirm of a man forcibly detained on ship-board, that he has always in his power the remedy of jumping over-board. It cannot be said in the same sense, as of two partners in a mercantile transaction, that either of them when he pleases may dissolve the partnership. At least, we should be much obliged to any lawyer who would point out to us

<sup>r</sup> Chap. iv. § 3, and § 9.

the constitutional process by which the Church of England might assert her independence, only giving up her temporal advantages, and not incurring the penalties of Premunire, *except she could obtain the consent of the Civil Government.* Until this be made out, it really appears to us that the remedy which she is here stated to have reserved, is one which no power on earth could have deprived her of; it is just the martyr's and confessor's remedy, leave to suffer, when in conscience she dares not obey.

At the risk of seeming both tedious and quarrelsome, we will add a few remarks on one more head, which may well make an English Churchman anxious, on comparing what he reads of with what he sees. We allude to a feeling already mentioned, the excess of our Church's nationality; the prevalence in it of what perhaps may be called not unfitly a sort of *ultra-Anglican* spirit. Mr. Gladstone, in his valuable chapters on the "Abuse of Private Judgment and on Toleration," brings out, in a way to us both original and convincing, the fact that nationality was the leading principle of the English Reformation. That movement, he says, "was the establishment of a national exemption from external restraint in matters of religion. The question between the nation, either through its Church or its State and the individual," i. e. the question of toleration, "was of subsequent growths." . . . "The first assertion of religious liberty was for the nation, as against what lay beyond the nation, and not for the private individual, as against all but himself. And the doctrine grew imperceptibly by unconscious and progressive deflections from the rule of arbitrary power<sup>t</sup>." The preamble of 24 Hen. VIII., chap. 12, which Act abolishes the papal supremacy, declares that the Spirituality of the realm of England, "'usually called the English Church, hath always been thought, and is also at this hour, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties, as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.'

"We have here a clear view of the notion under which

<sup>s</sup> Chap. v. 61.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. 62.

separation took place. The nation of England said: We are an organized and integral whole, both in secular and spiritual matters, capable of self-government and self-direction<sup>u</sup>."

"That the question of the English Reformation was eminently and specially national; that it was raised as between this island of the free on the one hand, and an 'Italian priest' on the other, is a remarkable truth, which derives equally remarkable illustrations from our history. The main subject of contention between the State and the Romanists, or Recusants as they were called, was not their adhesion to this or that popish doctrine, but their acknowledgment of an unnational and anti-national head. To meet this case the oath of supremacy was framed."

Nor was this merely the legal and abstract view of the transaction: there are places in Shakspeare, to go no further, which indicate unequivocally the popular feeling to have been the same:—

"What earthly name to interrogatories  
Can task the free breath of a sacred king?  
Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name  
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous,  
To charge me to an answer, as the pope.  
Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England  
Add thus much more,—that no Italian priest  
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions:  
But as we, under heaven, are supreme head,  
So, under him, that great supremacy,  
Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,  
Without the assistance of a mortal hand;  
So tell the pope; all reverence set apart,  
To him, and his usurped authority<sup>x</sup>."

And again,—

"Though you, and all the kings of Christendom,  
Are led so grossly by this meddling priest,  
Dreading the curse that money may buy out."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Yet I alone, alone do me oppose,  
Against the pope, and count his friends my foes<sup>v</sup>."

<sup>u</sup> §§ 63, 64.

<sup>v</sup> King John, iii. 1.

Now it will hardly be denied that some of the above expressions, to an ear versed in the old ecclesiastical language, carry rather an unprimitive, uncatholic sound: they savour a little of the *fastus occidentalium*, the complaint of which is as old as St. Basil. The provocation from Rome was doubtless great; but it is one of the miserable consequences of pride and usurpation to make those who resist them proud and usurpers in their turn: and those who reflect on the strict bond of union, which by the law of Christ subsists among all Churches everywhere, will find perhaps something to scruple at in a claim by any one national Church to be considered "an integral whole in spiritual matters," and to exclude "the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons to determine any doubts." In fact, this exclusiveness has been virtually disavowed by those Anglicans who from time to time have appealed, as Cranmer and Bramhall, to a lawful general council, when such may be had; yet the spirit of it undoubtedly leavens our Church, in some respects, with good effect, but in others more entirely than might be wished. We are apt to think more of our nurse than of our mother, and, as might be expected from an insular temper, to be more frightened by the word *un-English*, than by the words sectarian and un-catholic. If it were not for some feeling of this kind, could we have endured to exclude so long from our altars the Bishops and Priests of America and Scotland? Should we not ere now have fallen on some arrangement whereby all invidious distinctions between their ordinations and ours might be done away? Would those unprohibited ceremonies, such as turning to the east, whereby we may express our desire to be in more perfect communion with the whole Church, excite so much displeasure and suspicion as they do? Would not our missionaries and travellers, and the societies which authorize them, be a little more scrupulous of disquieting foreign Churches, such as the Greek and Abyssinian, by openly slighting their usages, and setting up our own worship as in opposition to theirs? It has been well for England, no doubt, that this sort of stubborn nationality has kept us, as in the days of Edward VI., from the too close intercourse which many desired with foreign

schismatical bodies ; but the primitive hatred of separation would as effectually have done that, as it would have retained us in communion, or at least in the wish for communion, with all who have not lost the essence of the Church, and of faith. It is curious, and not unimportant, to observe, how this same English self-will extends itself into the detail of our Church arrangements, interfering not a little with reverence, order, and obedience. In such matters, for example, as where we are to be placed in church, and whether we shall sit, stand, or kneel, and whether we will make any responses, and when ; and in all our demeanour as subjects of pastoral care, many of us seem anxious to prove ourselves

“*penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos :*”

and the feeling appears to be respected and encouraged, as English, sound, and manly, by persons who would surely find something to deprecate in it had they not been accustomed to take their own standard too partially from the sixteenth century. When one considers, on the one hand, the mysterious intenseness of our Lord's Prayer for the unity of His whole Church, and, on the other, the present miserable state of Christendom, for want of that unity ; when one looks back to the days of General Councils, and of letters commendatory between Church and Church, and recollects that they were contemporaneous with the days of uninterrupted order and Catholic consent ; our complete separation from other Churches will appear no slight drawback on the benefit we have gained by asserting ourselves an “*island of the free ;*” nor will any usage, prejudice, or enactment, appear a trifling evil, which tends to that sort of sullen, moody independence.

Reverting then to the divinely-suggested standard for adjusting the relation of the State to the Church, it would seem that the Nursing Fathers in God's household cannot in faithfulness either neglect the laws which He has set for the correction of His erring children, or take into their own hands the regulation of the whole family, or separate at their will between the portions of it, when He has ordained that all should live in mutual intercourse ; that under all these heads, the State in England is clearly in sin ; and that it is at least doubtful how far the Church has made herself a party

to that sin. What then follows? are we to separate from her? to become Romanists, or found a new sect? By no means: and for this plain reason, that she is still the Church, the true mystical Body of Jesus Christ, having His commission, His word, and His sacraments, from whom it is unlawful to separate in any case, even though she exacted unlawful terms of communion: we should then only have to bear her censures patiently; and as yet (we cannot be too thankful for it) she does not exact unlawful terms of communion; none of her members are obliged in any way to assent, either to the suppression of discipline, or to the State usurpations of legislative power, or to the virtual excommunication, in part, of the foreign Churches. If indeed we were forced to accept Bishop Elrington's interpretation of the clause in the Ordination Service; if we believed that a priest's adherence to "the Discipline of Christ as this Church and Realm hath received the same," implied the validity of such laws as the Irish Church Bill, passed as it was; then indeed we should think it impossible to be in other than lay communion with the Church in England; but we do not so construe that engagement; we consider that it pledges us to the formularies of the Church, not to the usurpations of the State; and thus convinced, though we thought even more deeply and positively than we do of the Church's part in the transgressions above enumerated, it would not in the least tend to drive us from her communion. It is an old canon, and settled long ago by the whole Church against the Donatists, that no amount of faultiness in Church governors can make separation cease to be schism. Not to dwell on the argument so largely unfolded by Mr. Palmer and others, which appears a decisive one, certainly, as against Romanists, that if unscriptural concession in this kind unchurches a community, the Roman Church herself has strayed out of Christ's pale, since no intrusion of the civil power in England can be named, but it may find its parallel in some country of the Roman obedience, and that with formal sanction of Papal authority.

What then, it may be inquired, is the use of stirring topics so delicate at all? Is it not an unpractical, gratuitous

agitating of consciences? In the first place, there is the great duty of warning and protest, of which our Church herself sets us an example, in the matter of discipline, yearly in the Communion Service. And may we not venture to expound the second paragraph of the Thirty-seventh Article as a similar protest against other usurpations of Church authority by the civil power? Be that as it may, the ministers of the Church Catholic, which is the manifestation of the Judge's presence, are bound to denounce all that He will then condemn, whether in individual or corporate members of His body: and it would indeed be an intolerable consequence of our establishment, if it forbade the watchman's putting his trumpet to his mouth.

Again, there is the duty of prayer and intercession, for the due performance of which it is most desirable that we should have, even as private Christians, tolerably correct views of our position as a Church. The great lights of our own Church, the Andreweses, the Wilsons, the Leslies, and the Taylors, have left us models of assiduous prayer on these very subjects: as that sovereigns and their nobles "may have much power for, and none against, the truth \*;" that "godly discipline may be restored and countenanced †;" that "God would lay to His hand, now that men have made void His law ‡;" that He would "unite all the members of the Church in faith, hope, and charity, and an external communion, when it shall seem good in His eyes §." If one could succeed in calmly stating the grievances of our Church, so as to make such intercessions general and fervent among her dutiful children; those who believe what the Bible says of prayer, will not think slightly of the service so rendered to her.

But further; our views on these important public matters influence our personal feelings and conduct more perhaps than we might beforehand imagine. The great question of *Utile* against *Honestum* cannot be once seriously decided, even as a mere speculation, or in a matter of history, without producing a tendency to decide again in the same way

\* Bishop Andrewes' "Devotions."

† Bishop Wilson's "Sacra Privata."

‡ Prayer prefixed to Leslie's "Case of the Regale."

§ Bishop Taylor's

"Holy Living."

on the next occasion, great or small, domestic or national, on which it comes before us. For example, a man has been used to judge this way or that of the conduct of Cranmer or of Laud in the several conjunctures which gave colour to their lives and fortunes; can we doubt that when he himself comes to be tried, on a small scale perhaps, in the government of his parish, or his estate, his own conduct will insensibly take a tinge, he will be either stubborn or compromising, according to what he has been used to admire or condemn? Will not his standard on all other matters, unconsciously to himself, be lowered or elevated? and that more effectually, the more sacred the one point is which happens first to occasion this trial of his moral sense?

Moreover, there is a sort of confident exulting tone which whenever a man takes in his estimate of his country, and of public measures, it augurs but ill for the tenderness of his conscience in general; and that especially among Englishmen, who are apt, in a strange degree, to identify their own thoughts and feelings with the policy of their country and its parties. Whereas really to feel humbled and alarmed at the thought of the sins of our Church and country, compared with our many and great privileges; to "open our windows in our chamber towards Jerusalem," and bewail the sins we have committed—"we, our kings, our princes, and our fathers;"—is both a symptom and an exercise of true personal humiliation, and tends at least to pardon and relief, though small indeed may be our chance of seeing an angel "caused to fly swiftly" with the message of our deliverance. The very doubt we feel so often, both as to the conduct of those we read of, and as to our own conduct in real or possible cases, is a humbling, and therefore a salutary, circumstance: it makes us sit looser to a world, which at best we find is very "full of perplexities;" whereas the kind of optimism which would overrule all such misgivings, may nourish under the guise of contentment a good deal of self-satisfaction and love of worldly ease. It has been said, "the outward peace of the Church distils into peace of conscience<sup>b</sup>;" much more truly, we apprehend, might it be said, that a certain corroding care and fear about her public

<sup>b</sup> Bacon's "Essays."

conduct and interests, occasioned by a deep estimate of her mysterious privileges, is likely to distil into a contrite mistrust and scrupulous watching of a man's own self.

More particularly are these contemplations likely to be wholesome to persons in our own condition, because it is so very evident, as far as human eye can discern, that nothing which any of us can do is likely to be of avail, directly, towards the visible deliverance of the Church; we are thrown back, more palpably almost than ever was any former generation, upon the instruments of a warfare merely passive: upon protests, and warnings, and prayer, and humiliation, and self-discipline. We deeply feel that it is a seasonable and friendly hint, which Mr. Gladstone has somewhere given; of the danger of self-will in the *reproducers*, as well as in the creators or inventors, of a system, and trust that it will not be lost on those whom it may concern. Yet the danger, we would hope, is in some degree diminished, when the effort is not voluntary, not the result of scheming and calculation, but is even forced on quiet persons by the seeming imminent and serious peril of God's household. In all but very childish minds, such emergencies, one should think, must subdue the tone of thought, and make men forget self for a while.

Upon the whole, while we deprecate as earnestly as the author, or any of those who think with him, the great national sin of rejecting the Church, there is one thing, we are free to confess, which appears to us yet more to be dreaded; and that is, the Church herself being induced, by fear of public evil or any other cause, to forego any of her sacred principles for the sake of retaining her connection, real or nominal, with the State. The sin of the temporal body would surely never be the less flagrant for its involving the spiritual body also; nor would the forfeiture of the heavenly blessing prove the less certain or less complete. And however fearful the view which may be taken of a world anti-Christianized by the downfall of establishments, might not a sadder picture be drawn, and one at least as likely to be realized, of a Church turned anti-Christian by corrupt establishments? a State succession of heretical pastors,

creeds omitted or corrupted, holy prayers and sacraments profaned, or modified, or cast by at the popular will; and all, amid the din of self-praise, and high pretensions to evangelical truth, and every corner of the land ringing with gratulations to England, on its containing, beyond question, "the most moral and religious people on the face of the earth?" This is the sort of anticipation which most alarms us; and the more, because it seems to exclude persecution; whereas the violent separation of Church and State almost appears to involve it. There is no blood of martyrs in the former prospect, no seed of future diffusion and victory: but suppose the power of the State in hands which studiously disowned all religious profession, and, notwithstanding the liberal vauntings of the age, we are much mistaken if pains and penalties would not soon be found for the resolute assertors of Church principle. The persons, at least, who represent the party which in that case would be uppermost, seem resolved to tolerate everything but intolerance, and to pronounce the Church, intolerance.

We shall be called sad alarmists; but it is as well, we think, to realize a little the tendencies of things; and we are far indeed from holding out either of the above-mentioned miserable consummations as inevitable. One of the Church's best human hopes, under that merciful Providence which has hitherto been so gracious to her in England, lies in the assurance that a chosen band will not be wanting of such persons as the author of the work before us, to assert those principles which all in their station are so strongly tempted to disown: even as it would be one among her consolations, should this evil age prevail, to know that they were still on her side, realizing, but in a diviner sense, the noble saying of old, *Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares, sed omnes omnium caritates PATRIA una complera est*; that is to say, "The Jerusalem from above, which is" and ought to be "free, the Mother of us all."

## APPENDIX.

---

THE subjoined letter to the Editor of the "British Magazine" does not appear, for whatever reason, to have been inserted in that publication. It is printed here, as supplying a more complete statement of the real sanctions and elements of Episcopal Jurisdiction than is to be found elsewhere, it is believed, in Mr. Keble's writings. It was accompanied by the following note to the Editor, Mr. Hugh James Rose.

*Fairford, 18 Jan., 1834.*

MY DEAR ROSE,—I don't know how you will like what I now send, and of course I shall be quite prepared for your "plucking it," as Newman and Froude say. So do, if you please, without fear of affronting me. I seem to have a great deal to say, and no time nor room to say it in. But I must just ask you in respect of Church-rates (about which I see you want us to make a stand), Is not the *principle already given up* by the Irish Bill? Another thing: would it not be a good way to have the said Bill, I mean an exact analysis of it, somewhere among your documents? I have heard it complained of as wanting. Also, should not Mr. McGhee's letters be there? if only for the better understanding of the Bishop of Ferns. . . . I take it for granted this (if received) will be too late for the next number, so we can recast and modify should you wish it.

Yours ever affectionately,

J. K., JUN.

---

*To the Editor of the "British Magazine."*

MY DEAR SIR,

Will you admit a few lines from one who cannot help feeling just now as if our Church were "on a needle's point," in regard of those principles by which she *is* a Church; and who fears that

her enemies, and those of her friends who are inclined to what he thinks undue concession, may take unintended advantage of some things contained in your supplemental number for last year? I allude chiefly (I hope with sincere respect) to the Letter of the Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns on the Church Temporalities Act.

The publication of that letter must be felt as a relief by those among the Clergy of Ireland (if there be any such) who, like myself, might otherwise have doubted whether their canonical obedience would allow them to submit themselves to the late parliamentary consolidation of dioceses. For the letter, in conjunction with expressions of a similar opinion from others of the Irish Hierarchy, removes the ground of that hesitation, by supplying episcopal sanction to the arrangement in question.

My own view of the matter was (as far as I can judge of it at this distance), that had I been so unfortunate as to have a cure in either of the suppressed dioceses, I should, in the event of the diocese becoming vacant, have consulted the Archbishop of the province, or the Primate, and have yielded obedience to his decision. I do not imagine that any of those who were most opposed to this measure, thought of setting up altar against altar, as his lordship, in one part of his letter, seems to imply. Their plan of resistance, if I do not mistake it, went entirely on the hypothesis of the Bishops themselves concurring with them, by a passive approbation at the least. That hypothesis being removed, the course to be adopted by the inferior clergy appears to me quite plain. The responsibility of the submission is transferred entirely from them to those without whom they cannot act, and by whose standard they are bound to abide. Their officers, as it were, command them to lay down their arms; and they have nothing to do but to obey.

The case, then, is ruled for the present. But the grounds on which the decision proceeds, so far as they have been stated, are open to respectful examination. At least, it may not be useless to suggest certain implied modifications and limits, under which, from the nature of the case, the positions of the letter were doubtless meant to be received.

It might be inferred from the tenor of the reasoning in pp. 473, 4, that the writer considered the ruling powers of a bishop, though not his powers of Consecration and Confirmation, as depending entirely on the civil state. But it is clear that this would be too hasty an inference; since (to go no farther) the Ordination Service, quoted in the same page, recognises such a thing as "THE

DISCIPLINE OF CHRIST:" distinct indeed from His Doctrine and Sacraments, but not less truly and exclusively His: containing some parts which "the LORD hath commanded," some which, being left open by Him, "this Church and Realm hath received" and settled, "according" (or not contrary) "to the commandments of GOD." The real question, therefore, between the Bishop and those with a view to whose statements he was writing, is not whether certain acts complained of are acts of ministerial or of ruling power; but, granting them to be of the latter class entirely, whether or no do they infringe on those particulars of CHRIST's Discipline, which "the LORD hath commanded," and which no Church nor Realm may annul? Now the Discipline of CHRIST, as distinguished from His Doctrine and Sacraments,—the ruling power of a Bishop, as distinguished from his power of Order,—must be comprised (with all ruling power) in the three-fold division of legislative, executive, and judicial. Of these, the last, the judicial, alone, is properly called Jurisdiction. As vested in Bishops, it is commonly entitled, the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: such, at least, is the exposition of that phrase, most generally received in the Church. Now, *this* power is unconcerned, except, perhaps, by remote implication, in the question of the Church Temporalities Bill. It is not touched, one way or the other; with regard to it, therefore, nothing is conceded by the qualified sanction which the Bishop has given to the bill. It is true that in one place his lordship distinguishes between acts of jurisdiction and acts purely episcopal. But the whole context shews that the part of jurisdiction, of which we are now speaking, viz., Excommunication and the processes leading to it, was not just then at all in his thoughts. He cannot fairly be construed as granting that the highest act of spiritual discipline is not an act purely episcopal: or with hinting that a prerogative, conveyed by our LORD Himself to His Apostles, along with the words, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST," is not, properly speaking, spiritual: nor can he be considered as casting any doubt on the due derivation of that prerogative, along with the powers of ordination and government, and on its present existence in the Bishops of England and Ireland. None of these admissions are at all involved in what he has stated concerning jurisdiction. His concessions, if any, refer entirely to the other two branches of ruling power: the legislative branch, which may appear to be affected by the manner in which the Act was passed; and the executive branch, supposed to be invaded by more than one of its principal clauses.

The Executive branch of episcopal power consists of the ordinary functions of Church government, such as controlling the application of Church funds, assigning ministers to their several cures, and the like. This, too, was committed by our LORD to His Apostles, not only by the general grant or charter, "as My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you:" but especially, by the prospective appointment at the Last Supper: "I appoint, or solemnly assign, to you a Kingdom, as My FATHER hath solemnly assigned to Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" i.e. according to a clearly intended analogy, exercising the highest administrative offices in the Church. These words, interpreted by the practice of the Apostles, and the uniform sense of the ancient Church, burthen their successors with a responsibility of which they cannot divest themselves; and those who would divest them, by force or chicane, are clear violators of Christ's appointment.

Thus far, I conceive, all agree, who are Churchmen on principle, and not for expediency or effect. Nor is there anything in the Bishop of Ferns's letter which militates against this statement. He says, indeed, that the civil power may interfere to *regulate* a Bishop's jurisdiction in this sense of the word, but he implies that the interference has its limit; a limit acknowledged in the final clause of the passage quoted by him from the Ordination Service, ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF GOD. Now these are theorems to which, no doubt, the warmest defenders of Church independence will assent. The only question is one of detail, whether certain proceedings directed by the Act come fairly within the range of secular interference, thus modified. Such are the instating of a Bishop in his see, without any form of Confirmation or instalment, by a mere decree of the secular authority. And again, in some instances, the permanent sequestration of a benefice, by authority of a certain commission, superseding that of the Bishop of the diocese. With regard to these acts, his lordship considers them legal, as involving no usurpation of the Power of Order, and amounting only to such regulation of the Bishop's *executive* jurisdiction as this Church has always permitted. In proof of which last position he cites the cases of the Crown appointing at one time a Coadjutor, at another Suffragan Bishops, without any Confirmation or instalment. In his lordship's view, these are details which the Hierarchy, if they deem expedient, may lawfully leave to the civil power, as they may lawfully trans-

fer others of their own functions, such as collation, institution, visitation, and in some cases the censure of offenders, to deputies of a lower rank in the Ministry; sometimes, it may be, even to laymen. And when they do so, their clergy and people are bound to acquiesce in their decision. Such, to the best of my understanding, is the substance and extent of the Bishop's allegations, as far as the *executive* part of episcopal jurisdiction is concerned. I do not now presume either to question or maintain the validity and sufficiency of those allegations. My object is gained if I have succeeded in pointing out that these are mere matters of detail, and do not by any means bind those who shall agree with his lordship's view, to sacrifice all points of episcopal jurisdiction which this or any future Parliament or Government may claim.

But the ruling power of the Apostles and their successors has ever been understood to imply, *thirdly*, the power of legislating for the Church, *as a Church*, i.e. in matters purely spiritual, and in mixed matters, so far as they are spiritual. In proof of this it is needless to dwell on the construction which some have proposed of the binding and loosing, spoken of in St. Matthew, as though it meant enacting and repealing laws. It is enough that CHRIST "appointed unto His Apostles a kingdom;" that He "sent them as He had been sent by His FATHER;" that they exercised the office of Church legislators as long as they lived, and were acknowledged by the Catholic Church to have bequeathed it, on their departure, to the Bishops. This being so, and it being also evident that the spiritual interests of the Church are greatly concerned in the distribution of "the peculiar and respective spheres of duty of the ministers of the Gospel," it follows that any arrangement of dioceses, in which the opinions of the episcopal body are overborne, is "an invasion of a fundamental principle of the Church." And if the constitution of any country be such as to enforce enactments of that kind, it is, so far, a permanent invasion of Church principles. Clearly the Church, by acceding to such a constitution, sacrifices more or less of the very Discipline of JESUS CHRIST. I do not see how this can be answered, except by supposing that the legislative power of the Apostles, though it were a part of our blessed Lord's institution, was not intended to be universal and permanent, and is in fact virtually repealed by the conversion of the civil magistrate or some other circumstance. To which I shall say no more at present, but only this, that such expounders would do well to be provided with a distinction, whereby to secure the permanent force of the other parts of our Saviour's institution.

Otherwise it seems neither impossible nor absurd, for those who have succeeded in depriving Bishops of the power of ecclesiastical legislation, to take from them, whenever they please, the power of Order also and of Excommunication, resting, as they do, on the same texts with the former, and all three being but equally supported by the testimony of the Catholic Church.

Our country, therefore, which on Scriptural grounds acknowledges the power of Order in Bishops, must thereby be understood to acknowledge in them a share in Ecclesiastical Legislation also. At least, the burthen of proof will lie on those of our jurists who maintain the contrary. And if conflicting precedents be found in our history, the greater weight in reason should be allowed to those who favour the episcopal prerogative, as being most in unison with the original ground on which our Bishops are avowedly received.

These considerations encourage me to hope that the claim adduced in their behalf of a real share in Church legislation is not so completely overthrown, as some appear to think, by the precedents of dioceses which at various times have been consolidated by Act of Parliament. For, not to dwell on the material consideration that the Prelacy of those times respectively were not, that we know of, at all averse to the several changes referred to, whereas it is notorious that the great majority of the Bishops earnestly deprecated the measures that have now been taken; nor to repeat, what however deserves remembrance, that Henry the Eighth had papal authority, procured before the separation, for his new arrangement of bishoprics; the principle, stated above, is recognised by the very existence of the Upper House of Convocation, in the theory at least and ideal platform of our Polity. It is implied in these words of the Thirty-fourth Article, "Every particular or national Church hath power to ordain, change, or abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church." The word "Church," in this proposition, must mean the several Estates of the Church, and cannot, therefore, exclude the highest. And I presume no Churchman will deny the Bishops to be the highest Estate in the Church *as such*. Finally, the statutes of the Realm acknowledge the four first general Councils as a main foundation of our ecclesiastical law. Now the second canon of the Council of Constantinople commits the ecclesiastical legislation of each province to the Bishops of that province, excluding foreign Bishops, and much more aliens and laymen<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> See also the twelfth and seventeenth Canons of Chalcedon.

All this and more would make one slow to think, that when a Prelate of our Church enforces obedience to the Church Temporalities' Act, he can mean to give up the general right of Bishops to be consulted in forming Church laws; and, indeed, the letter goes no such length. It strictly confines itself, as far as legislation is concerned, to the case in hand, the uniting and dividing of bishoprics. For that process in particular, his lordship thinks, there are precedents in English and Irish history, sufficient to make it the duty of the Bishops to give way to the present oppression, whatever their private sentiments may be.

Such, if I mistake not, is the full amount of concession, expressed or implied in this Canonical Epistle (if I may adopt such an old ecclesiastical phrase) of a truly learned and venerable Prelate. The matter of *Jurisdiction*, properly so called, i. e. of Excommunication and the preparatory steps, he does not even touch upon; nor yet upon the general question, what share the Prelates of a Christian realm may claim by CHRIST's ordinance in ecclesiastical legislation; but assuming the Act to have, virtually, episcopal assent, he vindicates some particular provisions of it from the charge of so violating Church principles as to require disobedience on the part of the inferior clergy.

At the same time, I respectfully submit, that the main scruple of all remains unremoved: the scruple arising from serious doubt how far the late changes in the Constitution affect the right of Parliament to legislate for the Church. Many considerate persons think, that the changes are so vital, so wrought into the very ground of the system, as to amount to a virtual breach of the terms of union between Church and State. So that, in their judgment, the governors of the Church are at liberty, whenever in their consciences they shall deem it most expedient, to decline submitting themselves to the ecclesiastical laws of the Parliament. For the two societies are no longer identical, according to the theory of Hooker and the practice of the days of Queen Elizabeth; nor yet allied on certain fixed terms, according to the Toleration and Test Laws, the rationale of which Warburton developed. As far as this change extends, arguments from ancient practice would appear to be inconclusive on questions of present right. But of this difficulty we look in vain for any solution in the Bishop's letter. It is passed over in total silence. Perhaps, in a solemn official document, it would have been improper to admit such a thought, even with a view to exposure and correction.

In one respect, however, the omission is much to be lamented; namely, that it gives an air of fallaciousness to some portions of

the reasoning in the letter. For instance, several cases are quoted of Irish dioceses consolidated by Act of Parliament; and it is concluded "an error to suppose that the peculiar and respective spheres of the ministers of the Gospel have been arranged by *the Church*." Now the word Church here, as every one perceives, must mean the clergy as distinguished from laymen. But those who, in 1834, are claiming for *the Church* the right of ecclesiastical legislation, use the word in its proper sense, as opposed to heretics and other aliens.

Again, his lordship presses on his clergy the sacerdotal engagement at the time of ordination, by which we are pledged to "minister the Discipline of CHRIST, as this Church and Realm hath received the same." Yet this will evidently bear an argument leading just to the opposite conclusion. In case of any great change, a question evidently may arise, whether by *conforming* to such change we may not be swerving too far from what "this Church and Realm HATH RECEIVED." It is clear the engagement was meant as a test of the candidate's conformity to something which he found established, not of his submitting prospectively to possible changes. Although no Christian man can doubt the duty of obeying "the customs of the Realm," where the law of God will permit. But whether the law of God *does* permit the continued acquiescence of those entrusted with the Church in a system which permits aliens and heretics to bear the chief sway in legislating for her,—this is the very point in dispute.

The writer makes no question, that many of the distinctions drawn above will seem to many persons mere instances of over-refining; yet he is not ashamed to own, that he clings to them with a very peculiar interest, not seeing any other mode of reconciling the principles of Scripture and Antiquity with the practice of the Church since the Reformation. Yet he knows too well his great want of skill, both in legal and in historical questions, to depend very positively upon his own views of the conduct of our ancestors. It is too possible he may be mistaken in his notions of what has hitherto been the constitution of the Anglican Church as linked to the State. Principles and practices *may* have been long ago recognised, which would make it, in consistency, necessary for her to concede the full claims of this or any future Parliament. So that, if on grounds of "conciliation," or œconomy, our Hierarchy were reduced to one single Bishop, still our assent to "the customs of the Realm" would bind us to submit to such a regulation.

All this may be so. But if the writer does not wholly misun-

derstand the commission of our LORD to His Apostles and their successors, the day which shall see these things unquestionably proved will render it the sacred duty of us all to exert ourselves, in every allowable way, for the breaking of such an unhallowed bond. For, indeed, the only parallel which occurs, apt to represent our condition in the case supposed, is furnished by the tyrant Mezentius in Virgil :

“Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis,  
Componens manibusque manus atque oribus ora,  
Tormenti genus !”

I am, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

*Μισονεολόγος.*







*PRIMITIVE TRADITION RECOGNISED IN HOLY SCRIPTURE:*

A

# S E R M O N,

PREACHED IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF WINCHESTER,

AT THE VISITATION

OF THE WORSHIPFUL AND REVEREND

WILLIAM DEALTRY, D.D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE,

SEPTEMBER 27, 1836.

THIRD EDITION,

WITH A POSTSCRIPT,

ILLUSTRATIVE OF SOME POINTS IN THE ARGUMENT OF THE SERMON:

TO WHICH IS SUGGESTED,

CATENA PATRUM, No. III.

(BEING NO. LXXVIII. OF "THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.")

BY THE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

VICAR OF HURSLEY,

AND PROFESSOR OF POETRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE:

AND SOLD BY

PARKER, OXFORD. JACOB & JOHNSON, & ROBBINS, WINCHESTER

1837.

“ It is not here intended that the doctrine of the Church should be the rule of faith distinctly from, much less against, the Scripture; for that were a contradiction, to suppose the Church, and yet speaking and acting against the will of God; but it means, that where the question is concerning an obscure place of Scripture, the practice of the Catholic Church is the best commentary.”—Bp. Taylor, vi. 521. Ed. Heber.

TO THE WORSHIPFUL AND REVEREND

WILLIAM DEALTRY, D.D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE OF WINTON;

AND TO THE REVEREND THE CLERGY OF THE DEANERIES MEETING

AT WINCHESTER;

THIS SERMON

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED :

HAVING BEEN PREACHED BEFORE THEM,

AND BEING NOW PUBLISHED IN DEFERENCE TO THEIR EXPRESSED

WISH

OF EXAMINING AT THEIR LEISURE THE STATEMENTS

THEREIN CONTAINED.



A  
S E R M O N,

8c.

---

2 TIM. i. 14.

THAT GOOD THING WHICH WAS COMMITTED UNTO THEE KEEP BY THE  
HOLY GHOST WHICH DWELLETH IN US.

ΤΗΝ ΚΑΛΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΤΑΘΗΚΗΝ ΦΙΛΑΞΟΝ ΔΙΑ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ  
ἉΓΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ἘΝΟΙΚΟΥΝΤΟΣ ἘΝ ἙΜΙΝ.

WHATEVER men may severally anticipate concerning the final issue of the many anxious discussions which at present occupy the Catholic Church in England, all, I suppose, must feel that for the time they occasion a great perplexity and doubtfulness of mind. We are beset on every side (the clergy more especially) with conflicting difficulties, and temptations to unworthy compromise. That man must be either very confident in the accuracy of his own views, or very highly favoured in respect of clearness of judgment, or very successful in keeping himself out of the way of all controversy, who has not repeatedly found himself at a loss, within the last seven years, on such points as the following :—What are the limits of the civil power in ecclesiastical matters, and how far we may venture in the way of submission without

sacrifice of church principle : how the freedom of the Anglican church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church : again, how the method of voluntary combination, so generally resorted to in our days for important ecclesiastical objects, may be reconciled with entire deference to episcopal prerogative ; how CHRIST's ministers may “ study to be quiet,” and yet do their duty as watchmen, and not let their people slumber in the midst of danger ; and how they may best unite unwearied meekness in judging, and active Christian love, with strict reserve and timely censure towards every one that walketh disorderly. The time was, not long since, when many of these points appeared to most of us as mere historical curiosities. We felt, perhaps, that they were, abstractedly, of grave importance, but we thanked GOD that our lot was cast in times which required not of us, as pastors and stewards in CHRIST's service, any distinct consideration and settled views concerning them. Now things are different : the course of God's providence has permitted the enemies or prompted the defenders of the Church to lay bare her very foundations ; and it has become imperative on us all, in discharge of our ordination vows, to make up our minds as well as we can, and endeavour to see our own way, on

points which we should gladly, if we might, have taken on trust.

It cannot be safe to shrink from this duty, and say, as many seem inclined to do, that we could bear persecution itself better than the perplexity of considering such things, or the responsibility of deciding for ourselves, and agitating others, concerning them. We have put our hand to the plough, and we must not — we dare not — look back. It is too late for sworn and ordained priests and ministers in the Church of God to dream of drawing back from responsibility. The nature of the case contradicts the very thought. For what responsibility can be more fearful than *his*, who indolently and unthinkingly gives his assent to changes, which, for aught he knows, may prove not only ruinous in the event, but in theory and principle also opposed to the truths and ordinances wherewith CHRIST has put him in trust? Dismissing, therefore, as a snare of our great enemy, the false comfort which many of us, perhaps, are too much inclined to take to ourselves, from a notion that by not interfering we keep ourselves irresponsible, let us see whether the unprejudiced study of those parts of Scripture, which are obviously best suited to our case, may not supply us with a better and more genuine comfort, by furnishing some one clear and unquestionable rule, which may go a good way in guiding us rightly,

independent of all results : showing us where our chief responsibility lies, and to which, among interests and duties apparently conflicting, we are bound always to give the preference.

It is natural, in such an inquiry, to turn immediately to the two Epistles to Timothy, especially the last. For, undoubtedly, it must have been to that holy Bishop a time of very great perplexity, when his guide and father in the faith was on the eve of departing from him : the heretics also, as appears from many passages, already beginning to infest the Asiatic churches, according to St. Paul's own prophecy. It appears from the opening of the second Epistle, that when all doubt was taken away as to St. Paul's approaching martyrdom, his affectionate disciple was in danger of being overwhelmed by his sorrow for so great a loss, joined to his sense of the heavy burden which would be laid on himself, now left comparatively alone. To these two feelings in the breast of Timothy the Apostle in his farewell letter addresses himself : remembering, as he says <sup>1</sup>, the tears which Timothy had shed, perhaps when they had last parted from each other, and longing the more for the satisfaction of seeing him again. In the mean time, there are two words, which he seems studiously to repeat again and again, that he may leave them

<sup>1</sup> Ch. iii. 1

sounding, as it were, in his disciple's ears, for remembrancers of the two duties most pressing at the moment: ΚΑΚΟΠΑΘΗΣΟΝ, and ΠΑΡΑΚΑΤΑΘΗΚΗ: "endure hardness," and "keep that committed to thy charge."

First, with reference to the dejection of mind, by which Timothy was then suffering: "endure hardness," says the Apostle <sup>1</sup>, "as a good soldier of JESUS CHRIST;" "endure <sup>2</sup> affliction, make full proof of thy ministry;" "be thou <sup>3</sup> partaker of the affliction of the Gospel, according to the power of GOD." The drift of all which warnings is the same as where he reminds the Thessalonians <sup>4</sup>, "When we were "with you, we told you that we should suffer tribulation; even as it came to pass, and ye know." Affliction, hardness, trial, tribulation, is the very atmosphere of the gospel ministry; we never had cause to expect anything else. "Do not, therefore," (so the Apostle implies,) "do not shrink thus overtenderly from the thought of losing me, which, "you now see, comes into your ordained portion "of trouble." "Be not ashamed of the testimony "of our LORD, nor of me his prisoner;" do not carry your affectionate regret so far as almost to cause an appearance of defective faith. Do not take it to heart so very bitterly, as if you in some sort regretted your Christian engagement, finding so

<sup>1</sup> Ch. ii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. iv. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. i. 8.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 4

much to be borne beyond your expectation ; as if you were sorry that you had put so much confidence in me. But, instead of vain regret, take comfort in doing your duty ; resort to that fountain of supernatural grace which was opened for you when you were consecrated to be an Apostle. “ Remember that thou stir up the gift of God which “ is in thee by the imposition of my hands. For the “ SPIRIT which we both of us then received was not “ a spirit of fear,” of unworthy sadness and cowardice ; excessive, unreasonable dejection can be no fruit of it. Such were the tender expostulations and chidings of St. Paul, well beseeeming the kindest and most thoughtful of parents recalling his own son in the faith to a manly firmness. Then, in the temper of a noble and true soldier, he propounds his own example, teaches his younger comrade the way of consolation which he found most effectual for himself. “ Because I am ordained a herald and “ apostle and teacher, I suffer these things : but “ I am not ashamed, for I know in whom I have “ believed, and am persuaded that he is able to “ keep that which I have committed unto him “ against that day.” And elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, “ I suffer evil, “ as a malefactor, even unto bonds, but the word of “ God is not bound.” What can be more animating, what more affecting, than to witness a per-

<sup>1</sup> Ch. ii. 9.

son like St. Paul, full of conscious energy, power, and usefulness, thus devoutly reconciling himself to that which, humanly speaking, would have seemed the most untimely interruption of his labours? It is clear, I think, that even St. Paul found this a severe struggle; but he cheers himself, as in his former imprisonment; when he wrote to the Philippians, that the taunts of his enemies on his confinement had turned out rather to the furtherance of the Gospel, causing his bonds in CHRIST to be spoken of in the palace of the Cæsars, and in all places: so that even those who in speaking of his sufferings meant nothing but envy and strife, did in a manner preach CHRIST, *i. e.* make His Gospel known, and draw popular attention to His Name<sup>1</sup>. Such I take to be the true meaning of that often alleged text; far from conveying the encouragement, which some think they find in it, to irregular and schismatical efforts, but fraught with abundant consolation for those, who being anxious for the Church in evil times, feel themselves precluded from active exertions on her behalf. They can always say to themselves, “The Word of GOD is not bound: He can make “even envy and strife involuntary heralds of His “cause.” Their fidelity in acting while they could is rewarded with the assurance of a strong faith, that when *their* work is over, GOD’s eternal and

<sup>1</sup> See Note (A) in the Appendix.

glorious work is still in progress, although they cannot see how.

But we dare not take this comfort to ourselves,—we dare not, in those instances where we find the Church bound and fettered, mitigate our regret by exulting remembrance of the expansive inherent force of divine truth,—except we be really, in some tolerable measure, doing our best for her, so far as we are at liberty. The sense of our own responsibility, and of our faithfulness to it, must lie at the root of all true and solid consolation. To this, therefore, as the one thing needful, both for the cause and for himself, the Apostle most emphatically bespeaks his disciple's attention. He loses no opportunity of reminding him of the παρακαταθήκη, the charge, trust, deposit, which had been left jointly in both their hands, and in the hands of all commissioned as they were. Observe how naturally, with what dexterity of affection, he passes from the mention of his own trust to that of the same trust as committed to Timothy: “I am not ashamed, for I know in  
 “whom I have believed, and am persuaded that  
 “He is able to keep my deposit, τὴν παρακαταθήκην  
 “μου, against that day. Hold fast the form,” or,  
 “abide by the pattern or standard, of wholesome  
 “words which thou hast heard from me, by faith  
 “and love which is in CHRIST JESUS. That good  
 “thing committed unto thee” (literally, the good and noble deposit) “keep, by the HOLY GHOST

“ which dwelleth in us.” Surely these are words in which we ourselves are concerned, as deeply as he was, to whom they were first written. We are so far in Timothy’s case, that we are full of sorrow and perplexity at the condition in which we find the Church and Body of CHRIST JESUS: we would fain lay hold of Timothy’s and St. Paul’s consolation: let us first see to it, that we neglect not the warning given. To the companion of Apostles that warning was plain and simple. The duty imposed on him, paramount to all others, was simply to keep safe and entire a certain trust committed to his charge; to that one vital object all considerations of present expediency, temporal comfort, visible, apparent edification, were to give way. What that treasure was, Timothy could not be ignorant; nor yet could he be doubtful as to the celestial aid, by which, if not wanting to himself, he would surely be enabled to preserve it. But in both respects some consideration is requisite, before we of this day can fully apply the case to ourselves. It is not obvious at first sight, what this trust or treasure was: nor (of course) whether we are partakers of it: and even supposing those points settled, there might still remain a doubt, whether we have the same help for the faithful discharge of our trust, the HOLY GHOST dwelling in us. The consideration of these points in their order may not unfitly employ us on the present occasion.

1. And, first, as to the exact notion which we are to attach to the word *παρακαταθήκη*, “trust or deposit,” in this place : I observe that the very use of so general a word with the article implies that it had been by that time received among Christians as a term (if one may so speak) of their own, a part of the vocabulary of the holy Catholic Church. A diligent eye may detect, in St. Paul’s Epistles, many traces of the like use of language : current sayings, or senses of words, or formulæ, which the Apostle only just alludes to, as well known to all his readers. For instance, the expression, “This is a faithful saying,” which occurs repeatedly in these later Epistles, indicates, in all probability, so many Christian proverbs, familiar in the mouths of that generation of believers. Thus, in the first Epistle to Timothy, we have, “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that ‘CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners<sup>1</sup> :’ This is a faithful saying, ‘If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work<sup>2</sup> ;’ This is a faithful saying, ‘That therefore we both labour and suffer reproof, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe<sup>3</sup>.’” In the second Epistle<sup>4</sup>, “It is a faithful saying, ‘If we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer, we

<sup>1</sup> Ch. i. 15.<sup>2</sup> Ch. iii. 1.<sup>3</sup> Ch. iv. 9, 10.<sup>4</sup> Ch. ii. 11.

“shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He “also will deny us.” And to Titus, after a brief summary of the gospel way of salvation, which by the exact rhythm and order of its members might almost appear to be part of a primitive hymn<sup>1</sup>, St. Paul adds the same clause, “Faithful “is the saying.” From all which I argue, that there was a certain set of “sayings” current among the Christians of that time, to which any allusion or appeal, however brief, would be presently understood. Nor will it be hard to find examples of single words, which had evidently acquired by that time a Christian sense; so that, even when used absolutely, they could only be taken by Christians in a particular relation: such words, I mean, as τὸ μυστήριον, for “the scheme of super-  
“natural truth revealed in the Gospel, and more  
“especially in the doctrine of our LORD’s incarna-  
“tion;” ὁ ἐχθρὸς, for “the evil spirit;” ἡ ὁδὸς, for  
“the profession of Christianity.” These, and other examples which might be mentioned, make it surely not incredible, that ἡ παρακαταθήκη, “the deposit,  
“trust, or charge,” conveyed to Christian ears in those days a peculiar and definite, I had almost said a technical, meaning.

Now both this word and its kindred term, ἡ ἐντολὴ, “the commandment,” are mentioned in connection with errors to be avoided in *doctrine*.

<sup>1</sup> See Note (B) in the Appendix.

Thus, Timothy is warned<sup>1</sup> to “keep the deposit, “avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called.” Again, on mention made of the good confession, made by the same Timothy before many witnesses, at the time of his first calling to eternal life,—which “good “confession” can only mean the Apostles’ Creed, or some corresponding formula, recited at baptism,—St. Paul proceeds thus: “I exhort thee “before GOD and the LORD JESUS CHRIST, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, “that thou keep *the commandment* without spot, “unrebukable, until the appearing of our LORD “JESUS CHRIST.” Does not this appear as if “the confession” in the former verse had suggested the caution about “the commandment” or “commission” in the latter? and if so, what more probable than that “the commission” means the same treasure of doctrine which we know to have been embodied in the Confession or Creed?

This interpretation of the noun παρακατάθεκη, “deposit,” is confirmed by the repeated use of the kindred verb, παρατίθεσθαι, “to entrust, or commit,” in reference to Christian doctrine. For example, “This *commandment* I *commit* unto thee, son Timothy, that thou mightest charge some that they “*preach no other doctrine* <sup>2</sup>.” Elsewhere (a passage which seems to be sufficient alone to warrant the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. i. 18, 3.

proposed interpretation) Timothy is instructed concerning the things which he had heard from St. Paul "before many witnesses," *i. e.* as it should seem, at a kind of public charge at his ordination : —these he is directed to commit or entrust "to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also <sup>1</sup>." Ability to *teach* is the thing required : it is plain, therefore, that the test related principally to *doctrine* <sup>2</sup>.

Further, it will be observed that the phrase of the Apostle is absolute : *the* trust, not *your* trust ; the great trust of all, in which whosoever participates has reason to consider himself especially responsible to the great Judge of heaven and earth. And it is implied that the charge of St. Paul and that of Timothy were one and the same. "Keep the good deposit," says the Apostle, "by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us." Now, what St. Paul's trust was, the trust uppermost in his heart, he himself teaches, exclaiming, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, *I have kept the faith* <sup>3</sup>." He does not say, "I have kept the flock, I have kept those left in my charge ;" but, "I have kept the *faith*, the *truth* of CHRIST, the *doctrine* of the Gospel. I have watched it, and preserved it entire." Great as

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Note (C) in the Appendix

<sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 7

was the holy Apostle's anxiety for the souls which God had put under his care, his anxiety for the system of CHRIST, the kingdom of heaven, did at that moment apparently engross him more entirely. And it is clearly probable, that what he felt himself to be the main care, the chief trust of all, that he would recommend to his disciple in such words as those of the text, "That good thing which is committed unto thee, keep;" especially considering that those words immediately follow a caution which can only relate to doctrinal formulæ: "Hold fast," as a model for thyself, "the form of sound words," the course of healthful, orthodox interpretations and doctrines, "which thou hast heard of me." That "form of sound words," is it not obviously the same with "the good deposit" in the next verse?

Thus the context leads to the same exposition which, as we have seen, the parallel passages suggest—an exposition ratified also by the general consent of Christian antiquity. The good deposit is commonly understood by the Fathers to mean the *truths* committed by St. Paul to Timothy. Thus, in the paraphrase ascribed to St. Jerome<sup>1</sup>: "Watch over the deposit of the faith, entrusted to thy keeping by us. What thou hast not heard

<sup>1</sup> "Commendatum a nobis servandum tibi fidei depositum custodi. Quod a me non audisti, nec ab angelo si dicatur, libenter admittas." T. ix. 388. ed. Froben. Basil.

of me, though it were spoken by an angel, receive it not willingly." And a venerable father of the third century, Hippolytus, having quoted the expressions, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy charge," and, "The things which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men," remarks<sup>1</sup> that "the blessed Apostle used religious "care in delivering these *truths*, which were "easily accessible to all." And Vincent of Lerins<sup>2</sup>; "Keep," says the Apostle, "that which is committed to thy charge: *the Catholic faith*, as a talent, preserve thou inviolate and unalloyed."

<sup>1</sup> "Ορα δὲ μὴ εἰς ἀπίστον καὶ βλασφήμεν γλώσσαις ἐγκαταθῇ ταῦτα κίνδυνος γὰρ οὐχ ὁ τυχόν· μετὰ δὲ εὐλαβείᾳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως μετὰ φόβον ζῆν· οὐ γὰρ μάτην ὁ μακάριος Ἀπόστολος παρανῶν Τιμοθίῳ λέγει· ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος, κ. τ. λ. Καὶ πάλιν . . . ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν παρακλησέων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, κ. τ. λ. Εἰ οὖν ὁ μακάριος μετ' εὐλαβείας παρὲδίδον ταῦτα, ἅπερ ἅπασιν εὐγνωστα ἦν, βλέπων τῷ Πνεύματι, ὅτι οὐ πάντων ἦν ἡ πίστις· πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν, εἰ ἀπλῶς καὶ ὥς ἔτυχεν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγια μεταδώσωμεν βεβήλοις καὶ ἀναξίοις ἀνδράσιν; Dem. de Christo et Antichristo, ap. Biblioth. Patrum, Gallandi, t. ii. p. 418.

<sup>2</sup> Commonit. c. xxii. "Quid est *depositum*? id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinæ; non usurpationis privatæ, sed publicæ traditionis; rem ad te perductam, non a te prolatam; in qua non auctor debes esse, sed custos; non institutor, sed sectator; non ducens, sed sequens. '*Depositum*,' inquit, '*custodi*;' *catholicæ fidei talentum* inviolatum illibatumque conserva."

Upon the whole, we may assume with some confidence that the good thing left in Timothy's charge, thus absolutely to be kept at all events, was the treasure of apostolical doctrines and church rules<sup>1</sup>: the rules and doctrines which made up the charter of CHRIST's kingdom.

2. The next question to be settled is, whether the precept in the text apply literally to us: *i. e.* in other words, whether we have yet in our possession the identical deposit which St. Paul left with Timothy. For, *if* we have, mere natural piety would teach us to reverence and guard it as he was required to do.

Some will reply to this question at once, We have the Holy Scriptures, and we know for certain that they contain all that is important in Timothy's trust. These would resolve the custody of the good deposit into the simple duty of preserving the Scriptures incorrupt, and maintaining them in their due estimation among Christians. Undoubtedly this would be in some respects the least troublesome, if it could be proved the most correct and dutiful way. But can it be so proved?

We are naturally, if not reasonably, jealous of the word Tradition, associated as it is in our minds

<sup>1</sup> The insertion of "Church Rules" here has been objected to, as not being warranted by the preceding citations. But the sacraments, at least, were from the beginning Church Rules; and were not they part of the trust committed to Timothy, in common with all "Stewards of the mysteries of God?"

with the undue claims and pernicious errors of Rome. Yet must it not be owned, on fair consideration, that Timothy's deposit did comprise matter, independent of, and distinct from, the truths which are directly Scriptural? that it contained, besides the substance of Christian doctrine, a certain form, arrangement, selection, methodizing the whole, and distinguishing fundamentals; and also a certain system of church practice, both in government, discipline, and worship; of which, whatever portion we can prove to be still remaining, ought to be religiously guarded by us, even for the same reason that we reverence and retain that which is more properly scriptural, both being portions of the same divine treasure.

To these conclusions we are led by the consideration, first, that the truths and rules committed to Timothy's charge were at the time almost or wholly unwritten. This is clear from the very date of the Epistles which mention that charge: the latest of which must have been composed many years before St. John's gospel, and in the first of them the deposit in question is spoken of, not as an incomplete thing on its progress towards perfection, but as something so wholly sufficient, so unexceptionably accurate, as to require nothing but fidelity in its transmitters<sup>1</sup>. The holy writings themselves intimate, that the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 14, 20.

persons to whom they were addressed were in possession of a body of truth and duty, totally distinct from themselves and independent of them. Timothy, for instance, a few verses after the text, is enjoined to take measures for the transmission, not of holy Scripture, but of the things which he had heard of St. Paul among many witnesses<sup>1</sup>. The Thessalonians had been exhorted to hold the traditions which they had received, whether by word or apostolical letter<sup>2</sup>. They could not be exhorted to hold the Christian Scriptures, since at that time in all probability no Christian Scriptures yet existed, except perhaps St. Matthew's gospel. Much later we find St. Peter declaring to the whole body of Oriental Christians, that in neither of his Epistles did he profess to reveal to them any new truth or duty, but to "stir up their minds" by way of remembrance of the commandment of "the Apostles of the LORD and SAVIOUR"<sup>3</sup>. St. John refers believers, for a standard of doctrine, to the word which they had heard from the beginning<sup>4</sup>, and intimates that it was sufficient for their Christian communion if that word abode in them. If the Word, the Commandment, the Tradition, which the latest of these holy writers severally commend in these and similar passages, meant only or chiefly the Scriptures before written, would

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> 2 S. Pet. iii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> 1 S. John ii. 24.

there not appear a more significant mention of those Scriptures; something nearer the tone of our own divines, when they are delivering precepts on the Rule of Faith? As it is, the phraseology of the Epistles exactly concurs with what we should be led to expect: that the Church would be already in possession of the substance of saving Truth, in a sufficiently systematic form, by the sole teaching of the Apostles. As long as that teaching itself, or the accurate recollection of it, remained in the world, it must have constituted a standard or measure of Christian knowledge, though it had never seemed good to the Almighty to confer on us the additional boon of the books of the New Testament.

It can hardly be necessary to remind this audience, that these scattered notices are abundantly confirmed by the direct and formal testimony of the ecclesiastical writers of the age immediately following the Apostles. As often as Tertullian and Irenæus have false teachers to reprove, or unevangelical corruptions to expose, do they not refer to the tradition of the whole Church, as to something independent of the written word, and sufficient at that time to refute heresy, even alone? Do they not employ Church tradition as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the

Church, but by authority of that HOLY SPIRIT which inspired the oral teaching itself, of which such tradition is the record. Their practice is throughout in accordance with the following sentence of Irenæus<sup>1</sup>:—"We ought not to be still seeking among others for the truth, which it is easy to receive from the Church; since therein, as in a rich depository, the Apostles did most abundantly lodge all things appertaining to the truth: so that whoever will, may receive from her the waters of life. For the Church is the entrance to life: all the rest are but thieves and robbers. . . . And what if the Apostles themselves had left us no Scriptures? Ought we not to follow the course of tradition, such as they delivered it to those whom they entrusted with the Churches? Which rule is followed by many nations of the barbarians, those I mean who believe in Christ, without paper or ink, having salvation written in their hearts by the SPIRIT, and diligently keeping the old tradition." Then having recited the substance of the Apostles' Creed as a specimen of that tradition, he adds, "this faith those who without letters have believed, in respect of our language are indeed barbarians, but in respect of their views, habits, and conversation, have attained by faith a very high measure of illumination, and please God,

<sup>1</sup> See Note (D) in Appendix

walking in all justice, chastity, and wisdom. And if any one should relate to them in their own languages the new inventions of the heretics, they would presently shut their ears and escape as far as possible, not enduring so much as to hear the profane discourse." This noble passage I the rather quote, because it shews that the case which was just now put, of persons left without the Scriptures to depend on tradition alone, is not a mere dream of imagination, but at that time actually existed in some parts of the Christian world. There were instances, it seems, known to Irenæus, of true believers who did not as yet know any thing of the New Testament, yet were able to stop the mouths of heretics by merely avouching the ancient apostolical tradition. As was the condition, duty, and privileges, of those faithful and simple men, such would have been those of the whole Christian world, had the inspired Scriptures either remained unwritten, or perished with so many other monuments of antiquity. Faith in those divine truths with which the Church was originally entrusted would still have been required at the hands of Christian men; but the task of ascertaining those truths would have been far harder and more delicate. Now that it has pleased our gracious God to bestow on us, over and above, the use of His written word, can we be justified in slighting the original gift, on pretence of being able to do without it? Surely, in

whatever respect any tradition is really apostolical, to think lightly of it must be the same *kind* of sin, as if those unlearned and remote Christians, of whom Irenæus speaks, had thought lightly of the New Testament when it came to be propounded to them. We see at once in what manner sincere reverence for God's truth would lead them to treat the portions of His *written* word, as they were brought successively under their notice. If we will be impartial, we cannot hide it from ourselves, that His *unwritten* word, if it can be any how authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us ; and for exactly the same reason : *because it is His word.*

But, further : the fact is clearly demonstrable from Scripture, that as long as the canon of the New Testament was incomplete, the unwritten system served as a test even for the Apostles' own writings. Nothing was to be read, as canonical, except it agreed with the faith delivered once for all to the first generation of the saints. The directions of St. Paul on this subject are perfectly clear, and without reserve. "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema." And St. John, in his Epistles, strikes continually on the same chord. His language sounds like an emphatical protest against any suspicion of novelty or originality in his teaching. "Brethren, I write no new commandment

unto you, but the old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye heard from the beginning." He writes to them as to persons knowing the truth; knowing all things; not needing that any man teach them. He forbids their acquiescing without trial in any pretensions to spiritual gifts: he would have the spirits tried, whether they be of God, whatever their claim to be confirmed even by miracle; and the test or touchstone which he recommends is, agreement with the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation. "Every spirit that confesseth that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh, is not of God<sup>1</sup>." And his second Epistle speaks just the same language: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of CHRIST, hath not God; he that abideth in the doctrine of CHRIST, he hath both the FATHER and the SON<sup>2</sup>."

I do not see how we can be wrong in inferring, from these and similar passages, that the faith once for all delivered to the saints, in other words, Apostolical Tradition, was divinely appointed in the Church as the touchstone of canonical Scripture itself. No writing, however plausible the appearance of its having come from the Apostles, was to be accepted as theirs, if it taught any other

<sup>1</sup> S. John ii. 7. 20. 21. 27; iv. 1. 3

<sup>2</sup> S. John 9

doctrine than what they at first delivered : rather both it and its writers were to be anathema.

This use of apostolical tradition may well correct the presumptuous irreverence of disparaging the Fathers under plea of magnifying Scripture. Here is a tradition so highly honoured by the Almighty Founder and Guide of the Church, as to be made the standard and rule of His own divine Scriptures. The very writings of the Apostles were to be first tried by it, before they could be incorporated into the canon. Thus the Scriptures themselves, as it were, do homage to the tradition of the Apostles ; the despisers, therefore, of that tradition take part, inadvertently or profanely, with the despisers of the Scripture itself<sup>1</sup>.

On the other hand, it is no less evident that Scripture, being once ascertained, became in its turn a test for every thing claiming to be of Apostolical Tradition. But on this part of the subject there is the less occasion to dwell, it being, I suppose, allowed on all hands. Only it may be well to notice a distinction not always sufficiently kept in view by modern writers on the rule of faith ; viz. that whereas Scripture was from the beginning appealed to, of course, as a test of *positive* truth, it could only then be appealed to

<sup>1</sup> It is assumed in this paragraph, that where Scripture is silent, or ambiguous consent of the Fathers is a probable index of Apostolical tradition. See below, p. 31—42.

*negatively*, i. e. its silence could then only be quoted as excluding any point from the list of truths necessary to salvation, when itself had attained a certain degree of completeness. And this perhaps may be one reason why the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture is nowhere expressly affirmed in Scripture itself<sup>1</sup>. The character which our Article justly assigns to the Bible, of “so containing all things necessary to salvation, that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation :”—this character the Bible could not, from the very force of the terms, acquire, until a sufficient portion of its contents had appeared, to include in one place or another every one of such fundamentals. Nor are we sure of this condition having been fulfilled until the appearance of St. John’s Gospel and first Epistle, the latest, probably, of those canonical Scriptures of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church. This consideration may serve to account for the comparative rareness of quotations from the New Testament in the writings of the first century ; in the Epistle of St. Clement, for instance, who, while he produces in almost every paragraph some testimony

<sup>1</sup> See note (E) in Appendix.

from the Jewish Scriptures, has only three or four references to the New Testament: where such might be expected, he rather uses to remind men of “the depths of divine knowledge, which they had looked into<sup>1</sup> ;” of “the immortal knowledge, whereof they had tasted<sup>2</sup> ;” and of the apostolical examples which they had seen. Whereas the writers of the following age, Irenæus, Tertullian, and the rest, add to the argument from tradition, on which in itself they lay as much stress as St. Clement, authorities and arguments from the New Testament, much in the manner of controversialists of our own time.

From all this I gather, that in the interval between Clement and Ignatius on the one hand, Irenæus and Tertullian on the other, the canon of the New Testament had first become fixed and notorious, and then the fact had been observed, which is stated in our Article: That every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned books of that canon, taken along with the Hebrew Scriptures. And this observation, being once made, would of course immediately suggest that golden rule, not of the Anglican only, but of the Catholic Church; That nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith necessary to salvation, but what is contained in,

or may be proved by, canonical Scripture. At any rate it is unquestionable that by the time of Irenæus, *i. e.* towards the end of the second century, the fact had been universally recognized, and the maxim thoroughly grounded and incorporated into the system of the Catholic Church<sup>1</sup>.

Reserving thus the claim of Scripture to be sole and paramount as a rule of faith, we may now, I think, venture to assume, from the nature of the case, the incidental testimony of Scripture, and the direct assertions of the Fathers, that it was an unwritten system which the holy writers spoke of, when they so earnestly recommended the deposit, the commandment, the word heard from the beginning, to the reverential care both of pastors and of all Christian people.

Will it be said, "This is no concern of ours; it may be true in fact, but it yields no practical result; the traditionary system, whatever it was, having long ago passed away, except so far as it has been preserved in inspired writings?" This may be stated, and often is so, but can hardly be proved.

For in the first place, as long as it is only doubtful whether any statement or precept is part of the Apostolic system or no, so long a mind imbued with true devotion will treat that state-

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, Note (F).

ment or precept with reverence, will not rudely reject or scorn it, lest he refuse to entertain an angel unawares. So long, the mere fact of its not being contained in Scripture cannot be felt as a justification for casting it aside, any more than we should venture to disparage it on account of its not being revealed in any particular *book* of Scripture, which we might happen to value above the rest. Although not in Scripture, it may yet be a part of *their* rule, concerning whom the SON of GOD has declared, "He that heareth you, heareth ME; and he that despiseth you, despiseth ME."

But in truth it may be proved to the satisfaction of any reasonable mind, that not a few fragments yet remain, very precious and sacred fragments, of the unwritten teaching of the first age of the Church. The paramount authority, for example, of the successors of the Apostles in Church government; the threefold order established from the beginning; the virtue of the blessed Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice; infant Baptism; and above all, the Catholic doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity, as contained in the Nicene Creed. All these, however surely confirmed from Scripture, are yet ascertainable parts of the primitive, unwritten system, of which we yet enjoy the benefit. If any one ask, how we ascertain them; we answer, by application of the well-known rule, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*: Anti-

quity, Universality, Catholicity : tests similar to those which jurists are used to apply to the common or unwritten laws of any realm. If a maxim or custom can be traced back to a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary ; if it pervade all the different courts, established in different provinces for the administration of justice ; and, thirdly, if it be generally acknowledged in such sort, that contrary decisions have been disallowed and held invalid : then, whatever the exceptions to it may be, it is presumed to be part and parcel of our common law. On principles exactly analogous, the Church practices and rules above mentioned, and several others, ought, we contend, apart from all Scripture evidence, to be received as traditionary or common laws ecclesiastical. They who contend that the very notion of such tradition is a mere dream and extravagance ; who plead against it the uncertainty of history, the loss or probable corruption of records, the exceptions, deviations, interruptions which have occurred through the temporary prevalence of tyranny, heresy, or schism ; must, if they would be consistent, deny the validity of the most important portion of the laws of this, and of most other old countries.

It is not, therefore antecedently impossible that a system of tradition, subsidiary to the Scriptures, might yet exist in the commonwealth or city of

GOD. The rest is matter of investigation in each case, whether any given rule, interpretation, or custom, be traditionary in the required sense. But it will not be going too far into particulars, and may help to the understanding and application of the whole argument, if I point out three distinct fields of Christian knowledge, in neither of which can we advance satisfactorily or safely without constant appeal to tradition, such as has been described.

The first is, the *System and Arrangement of fundamental Articles*, so far as they have come down to us systematic and arranged. We, that is all of the Anglican Church who have had any regular training in theology, are so early taught to trace the Creed in the Scriptures, and to refer at once certain portions of both Testaments to certain high mysteries of the Catholic faith, that it commonly appears to ourselves as though we had learned those mysteries directly from the Scriptures. But there are few, surely, who on careful recollection would not be compelled to acknowledge that the Creed, or some corresponding catechetical instruction, had prepossessed them with these truths, before ever they thought of proving them from Holy Writ. I need hardly remind you of the unquestioned historical fact, that the very Nicene Creed itself, to which perhaps of all *formulae* we are most indebted for our

sound belief in the proper divinity of the Son of God—even this Creed had its origin, not from Scripture, but from tradition. The three hundred Bishops who joined in its promulgation did not profess to have collected it out of the Bible, but simply to express the faith which each of them had found in the Church which he represented, received by tradition from the Apostles<sup>1</sup>. Nor is this any disparagement to Scripture, nor need it excite any alarm for the great fundamental verity itself, which the Creed was meant to assert; any more than it would disparage the works of God, or shake the foundation of our faith in natural religion, were one to affirm that the power and Godhead of the Creator, although unquestionably proveable from the things which are made, would yet have remained unknown to the mass of mankind, but for primitive tradition, or subsequent revelation of it.

The second great subject, on which most of us are unconsciously indebted to the ancient Catholic tradition, is the *Interpretation of Scripture*, especially those parts of it which less obviously relate to the mysteries of the Gospel. Catholic tradition bears upon Scripture interpretation, not only indirectly, by supplying, as just now stated, certain great landmarks of apostolical doctrine, conform-

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, Note (G).

ably to which the written statements are all to be interpreted ; but also, in numerous cases, directly ; setting the Church's seal, as it were, upon one among many possible expositions of particular passages. For example : how else could we know, with tolerable certainty, that Melchizedek's feast is a type of the blessed eucharist <sup>1</sup> ? or that the book of Canticles is an allegory, representing the mystical union betwixt CHRIST and his Church <sup>2</sup> ? or that Wisdom, in the book of Proverbs, is a Name of the second Person in the Most Holy Trinity <sup>3</sup> ? All which interpretations, the moment they are heard, approve themselves to an unprejudiced mind, and must in all likelihood have come spontaneously into many readers' thoughts. But it may be questioned whether we could ever

<sup>1</sup> For this, see S. Cyprian, Ep. 63, p. 149, ed. Fell ; S. Augustin, de Civ. Dei, xviii, 20 ; S. Jerome, Ep. ad Marcellam, t. i. p. 123, ed. Frob. Basil. These with the distinct acknowledgment in the ancient Roman Liturgy, may perhaps be considered sufficient to represent the sense of the Western Churches. Among the Greeks, S. Chrysostom (on Gen. xiv.) clearly implies the same construction. But the reserve maintained by them on all liturgical subjects may account for their comparative silence on this point, even supposing them to have received the same interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> In this I believe all the Fathers who quote that divine Book (and most of them do so often) are agreed.

<sup>3</sup> The disputes on the text, Proverbs viii. 22, at the Nicene Council, are sufficient to prove agreement on this point. It is well known that the Arians alleged it, as it stands in the Septuagint, (ὁ Κύριος ἐκτίσέ με.) as a proof of the SON's inferiority. The Catholics never disputed the application of the text to our LORD, but denied the deduction from it.

have arrived at more than a plausible conjecture regarding them, but for the constant agreement of the early Church, taking notice every where, in these and the like instances, of the manner in which the Old Testament was divinely accommodated to the wonders of CHRIST's religion.

The third great field of apostolical tradition lies among *practical* matters, the *Discipline*, *Formularies*, and *Rites* of the Church of CHRIST: in regard of which, reason tells us that the Church Apostolical must here have had *some* method and system; yet it is evident to the very eye that the New Testament exhibits no such system in form, but only fragments and other indications of one in full operation at the time, and well known to those for whom the Apostles were writing. These fragments being found to coincide with similar but more copious indications in later Church records; consideration also being had of the religious reverence wherewith in those ages every thing primitive was regarded, and of the charitable jealousy of the Churches, watching each other for the purpose of remonstrating against unwarrantable deviations; we need not fear to accept in its fulness, on all such matters, the well-known rule of St. Augustin, which I give in the words of Hooker<sup>1</sup>: "Whatsoever positive order the whole

<sup>1</sup> E. P. vii. v 3, from Aug. Ep. 108, t. ii. 124.

Church every where doth observe, the same it must needs have received from the very Apostles themselves ; unless, perhaps, some general council were the authors of it." In this kind no one at all versed in Church history can be at a loss for examples of the benefit which the present Church derives from the chain of primitive tradition. Without its aid, humanly speaking, I do not see how we could now retain either real inward communion with our Lord through his Apostles, or the very outward face of God's Church and kingdom among us. Not to dwell on disputable cases : how, but by the tradition and practice of the early Church, can we demonstrate the observance of Sunday as the holiest day, or the permanent separation of the clergy from the people as a distinct order ? or where, except in the primitive Liturgies, a main branch of that tradition, can we find assurance that in the Holy Eucharist we consecrate as the Apostles did, and, consequently, that the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of CHRIST, and the bread which we break the communion of the body of CHRIST <sup>1</sup> ?

<sup>1</sup> Of course, in points of this kind, persons are at liberty, if they will, to content themselves with the common remark, 'Some order must have been adopted, and the Church had a right to adopt which she pleased.' It is among the privileges reserved for serious inquiring piety to discern an express will of God, as well in these ecclesiastical laws, as in others more immediately scriptural.

Whether, then, we look to Discipline, to Interpretation, or to Doctrine, every way we see reason to be thankful for many fragments of apostolical practice and teaching, most needful to guide us in the right use of Holy Scripture.

So it is, however, that either from impatience of authority, or dislike of trouble, or excessive dread of Romish error, tradition has become to most of us an unpalatable word, and we love not to allow that in any sense we rest our faith and practice upon it. And, as commonly happens when the mind is first made up, and reasons are to be found afterwards, objections the most contradictory are brought to justify this our determined disregard of antiquity. Sometimes it is urged that the matters involved are so many, so intricate and various, and demand such minute research, that it is out of the question bringing them within the reach of the great body of the clergy, however learned; sometimes, on the contrary, it is maintained, that the points agreed on in the whole ancient Church are obviously so few, there have been such constant discussions and waverings of opinion, that after all there is no such thing as primitive Catholic tradition; what is called such being merely the register of the dictates of that which has proved, on the whole, the strongest and most fashionable party in the

Church<sup>1</sup>. The one statement makes the field so wide, that it is impossible not to lose one's way in it; the other so contracted, that occupying it is no advantage. It is obvious that both objections cannot stand together; and, as might be expected, the truth lies between the two. On the one hand, we are not to imagine that every usage which has prevailed in any part of the Church, every opinion which has been upheld even among orthodox Fathers, claims to have been part of the system of the Apostles. On the other hand, we cannot surely deny such claim to those rules, in which *all* primitive Councils are uniform, those rites and formularies which are found in *all* primitive Liturgies, and those interpretations and principles of interpretation in which *all* orthodox Fathers agree; more especially when they produce them as undoubted and authoritative. Now the genuine canons of the primitive Councils, and the genuine fragments of the primitive Liturgies, are reducible into a small space; even although we go so low down in both as the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, including the six first Councils general, and excluding image-worship and similar corruptions by authority. As far, therefore, as the Councils and Liturgies are concerned, tracing

<sup>1</sup> See Note (H) in Appendix.

the remnant of apostolical tradition need not prove such a very overwhelming task. To establish consent among the Fathers is, doubtless, a far more laborious process ; easiest, however, where it is most desirable, *viz.* in the great points of faith and worship, as recurring continually, and implied in all other discussions. What remains is chiefly interpretation of Scripture ; a precious, inexhaustible mine of primitive knowledge, to such as have the zeal to explore it, but not essential to the fixing of the main outlines. Leaving out, for the present, all such incidental discussions, and confining our view to that which touches the foundation, we shall find that the matters are neither few nor unimportant, which are settled by traditionary evidence within reach of common students. Were they much fewer than they are, and less important, still, as unquestionable relics of the Apostles, a devout and thoughtful mind would prize them for their authors' sake, and for the sake of the lost treasure, whereof they are portions. To forget and disparage them, would be a hard and unnatural thing, like coldly refusing due reverence to the dead. As it is, by the gracious Providence of Almighty God, the points of Catholic consent known by tradition constitute the knots and ties of the whole system ; being such as these : the canon of Scripture, the full doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, the oblation and

consecration of the Eucharist, the apostolical Succession ; truths and orders soon enumerated, but such as to extend in vital efficacy through every part of the great scheme of the Church. What, then, if the Church in our time, for the sins of Christians, should have lost more or less of that good thing, the perfect apostolical body of government, doctrine, and sacramental grace, committed to St. Paul first, and by him to Timothy ? It is not the less our duty, and by God's grace we will regard it as our high privilege, to keep unwearied watch over what remains, and to preserve it, by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us.

3. These concluding words, while they supply an additional reason for extreme jealousy of our precious apostolical relics, open to us the appointed way of guarding what remains, and if one might be so happy, of recovering more : a way not our own, but strictly and properly supernatural. And thus we are conducted to the final point of our enquiry, Whether we, the existing Ministers of the Church, have the same grace dwelling in us, by which Timothy was exhorted to maintain his trust.

Now certainly the obvious meaning of the text is, that the treasure of sound doctrine was to be guarded by the grace of the apostolical succession. For St. Paul speaks of the HOLY GHOST dwelling

*in us ; i. e.* in himself and Timothy : and how it had passed from him to Timothy had been expressed a few verses before ; “ I will that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands.” The Church of England, you will remember, supplies full warrant for this interpretation ; by directing the same phrase to be solemnly repeated at the consecration of every Bishop : “ Remember that thou stir up the grace of God *which is given thee by this imposition of our hands ;*” and also where, in ordaining a Bishop or Presbyter, the solemn words are spoken, “ Receive the HOLY GHOST.” Our Church, therefore, does not teach us to consider the HOLY GHOST dwelling in St. Paul and Timothy as properly miraculous, a gift of extraordinary grace ; but as their portion of that SPIRIT which was to be poured out on all Apostles, and successors of the Apostles, for ever. It was not what is commonly called miraculous ; yet it was altogether supernatural. For no natural or acquired virtue or talent, though it might be called the *gift* of the HOLY GHOST, would ever be designated as the HOLY GHOST himself abiding in a man. Neither was it the preventing or assisting grace, common to all Christian persons ; for it was given to Timothy in particular by imposition of St. Paul’s hands. It could only be, what the Church interprets it, apostolical or episcopal grace.

Apostolical, then, or episcopal grace is by God's ordinance the guardian of sound doctrine ; the SPIRIT abiding in Timothy is to watch incessantly the deposit or trust of divine truth left in his charge : and where the one, the succession, fails, there, as this verse would lead us to expect, and as all Church history proves, the other, the truth of doctrine, is immediately in imminent jeopardy.

Here, then, we seem to have arrived at one cardinal point at least, whereby we may shape our course in times and emergencies more than usually perplexing. We are to look before all things to the integrity of the good deposit, the orthodox faith, the Creed of the Apostolical Church, guaranteed to us by Holy Scripture, and by consent of pure antiquity. Present opportunities of doing good ; external quietness, peace, and order ; a good understanding with the temporal and civil power ; the love and co-operation of those committed to our charge ;—these, and all other pastoral consolations, must be given up, though it be with a heavy heart, rather than we should yield one jot or one tittle of the faith once delivered to the Saints.

And whereas the dangers to that faith vary according to the differences of times, interests, and opinions ; and sometimes the scriptural, sometimes the traditionary safe-guards of it appear to

be more immediately threatened; both must be watched with jealous and impartial care, since comparative neglect of either is sure to be attended with ill consequences to both. Thus the reverence of the Latin Church for tradition, being applied unscrupulously, and without the necessary check from Scripture, to opinions and practices of a date comparatively recent, has led a large portion of Christendom to disuse and contempt, not of Scripture only, but of that real and sure tradition, which they might and ought to have religiously depended upon. On the other hand, is there not reason to fear that the Holy Scriptures themselves are fast losing reverence, through the resolute defiance of tradition, which some affect, in conformity, as they suppose, with the maxim, that the Bible only is the religion of Protestants? Surely it is no rare nor unnatural result, if such as are trained to this principle, being left, as some one has said, alone with their Bibles<sup>1</sup>, use their supposed liberty of interpretation, first in explaining away the mysterious meaning, and afterwards in lowering or evading the supernatural authority, of the very Scriptures which at first they deferred to exclusively. And no wonder; since among the traditionary truths which they are taught to undervalue is the canon of Scripture itself, and the principle also, the fundamental articles of

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, E. P. Pref. vii. 7.

belief, must be sought for in Scripture. In short, the sacred building is so divinely, though invisibly cemented, that for aught we know it is impossible to remove any portion, either of scriptural or traditional truth, without weakening the whole arch. We, to whom the whole is committed, under the most solemn of all pledges, and with the actual gift of the all-sufficient SPIRIT to aid us in redeeming that pledge ; let us, above all things, beware of the presumption of selecting for ourselves among the truths and laws of the Most High, *which* we will retain, and *which* we may venture to dispense with.

In the next place, let us beware of Novelty : novelty, I mean, as compared with the apostolic age ; not the mere appearance of novelty as compared with the current notions of our time. For it is self-evident that if in any age or country any portion of apostolical truth be lost, whenever it is revived it must for the time look new ; and its maintainers will have to contend with the prejudice which constantly waits on the disturbers of things established. Not novelty, therefore, relative to us, but novelty relative to the primitive and original standard, is the thing above all to be deprecated in the whole of theology, by whatever plausible air of originality, ingenuity, completeness, it may seem to recommend itself.

Observe under what a fearful penalty, in a

warning parallel to that of the text, St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, discourages every intrusion of speculative doctrine. The apostacy, he tells them, will come ; the wicked one shall be revealed, actuated by Satan, to deceive them that perish ; “ on whom GOD will send strong delusion, “ that they may believe a lie.” And then he proceeds, “ Wherefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold “ the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.” Is not this equivalent to saying, that whoever is studious of novelty in religion is in a way to take part with Antichrist ; that the only security against him, and the spirit which prepares the way for him, is to hold the apostolical doctrine, whether taught in word or in writing ; and to exclude all additions, however tempting to human ingenuity and love of system, however acutely they may appear to be reasoned out, and to fall in with allowed principles ?

Had this rule been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from transubstantiation on the one hand, as from the denial of CHRIST’s real presence on the other hand. The two errors in the original are but rationalism in different forms ; endeavours to explain away, and bring nearer to the human intellect, that which had been left thoroughly mysterious both by Scripture and tradition. They would both turn the attention of men from the real life-giving

miracle to mere metaphysical or grammatical subtilities, such as our fathers never knew.

Observe, again, the phraseology of the Apostle, how it is formed throughout upon the supposition that in the substance of the faith there is no such thing as improvement, discovery, evolution of new truths; none of those processes, which are the pride of human reason and knowledge, find any place here. Here the one thing needful is to “*retain* the mystery of the faith;” to “*abide* in “the good instruction whereto we have already “attained;” to “teach no *other* doctrine;” to be on our guard against those who resist the truth under pretence of “proceeding further,” assured that such, although they seem to be “ever learning,” shall never be able to “come to the knowledge of the truth;” they will “*proceed*” indeed, but it will be from bad to worse<sup>1</sup>. All these cautions, and others no less fearful, the HOLY SPIRIT has left for our admonition, directed not against any positive wrong opinion, but in general against the fatal error of treating theology like any human science, as a subject in which every succeeding age might be expected to advance on the former<sup>2</sup>.

Nor is the warning less important, nor the application to our times less certain, where

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 9; iv. 6; i. 3. 2 Tim. iii. 7. 9. 13. Προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix, Note (1).

Timothy is enjoined<sup>1</sup> to “keep that committed to “his charge, turning away from profane, empty “verbal discussions, and oppositions of knowledge “falsely so called.” The allusion was probably in the first instance to the low-minded empirical system of the Gnostics. But the words are not much less appropriate to that which may be called the *Nominalism* of our days; I mean the habit of resolving the high mysteries of the faith into mere circumstances of language, methods of speaking adapted to our weak understanding, but with no real counterpart in the nature of things. Whoever takes this line must needs hold the tradition of antiquity cheap, since it is based altogether on the supposition which he rejects as unphilosophical. Thus slighting tradition, and explaining away Scripture, there is no saying what pernicious heresy such a theorist may not fall into, if not happily guarded against himself by feelings and prejudices more reasonable than all his reasoning. Meantime the warning of Scripture is express: that they who “profess” such things may be expected to “err concerning the faith.” And it is plain that if at any time either the high places of the Church, or the schools of theological knowledge, should be left in such keeping, the guardians of the good deposit would be bound to

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

direct especial attention that way, and not permit things to pass away, as in a dream, before men are aware.

This leads directly to the recollection of a third danger, to which the Church seems especially exposed at this moment; I mean, that which is commonly entitled *Erastianism*; the Church betraying to the civil power more or less of the good deposit, which our LORD had put exclusively into her hands. This is a form of compromise with the world, for which no occasion was given by the circumstances of the Apostles: a trial peculiar to times like ours, when the governors of the world profess to have become the servants of our LORD and of His CHRIST. We cannot therefore look in the New Testament for literal instruction how to behave with regard to this delicate and dangerous part of our duty. The Gospel affording no express rules or precedents, we are thrown first upon the many analogous cases which the inspired records of the Jewish history supply; and then upon the conduct and determinations of the Catholic Church, in those centuries of her establishment during which the primitive system existed in something like integrity, to guide her demeanour in her altered condition. Yet, undoubtedly, the general rule, Keep the deposit, affects our relations to the civil authorities more immediately than persons unversed in church

matters might imagine. If we are to understand by "the deposit," the faith once for all committed to Christians; and if the apostolical succession be the appointed guard of that faith; and if the charter of the succession, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," convey the power of Church government as well as that of administering sacraments; then every undue sacrifice of the power of Church government to any earthly power is an infringement of the charter, and renders the deposit of the faith less secure. For the sake, therefore, of the very foundation of sound doctrine, and not only for the sake of peace and order in the Church, ecclesiastical government, as well as the custody of sacraments, should be jealously reserved in those hands to which CHRIST originally entrusted it. Nor do I see how it can be less than a sacred duty, however painful, and to human eyes unavailing, to protest, if we can do no more, against unauthorized intrusions on Church government, as every one will readily allow we ought to protest against unauthorized administration of sacraments <sup>1</sup>.

Such being the object for which we are set in defence, and such the enemies with whom we have to contend; such also the heavenly assist-

<sup>1</sup> See note (K) in Appendix

ant, dwelling in us and fighting on our side ; it cannot be hard to perceive with what dispositions we ought to address ourselves to that holy warfare. It will not do to shrink from responsibility, or to be over scrupulous in calculating immediate results. Once let us be reasonably assured that we are in the way of our duty, really keeping the good deposit ; and then, to use the words of the Prophet, we may “ set our faces like a flint, and need not be ashamed.” Then, as often as misgivings and alarms come over us, we must “ stir up the grace of GOD which is in us by imposition of apostolic hands.” For “ GOD hath not given us a SPIRIT of cowardice<sup>1</sup>, but of power, and of love, and of brotherly correction and reproof<sup>2</sup> ;” a SPIRIT that brings with Him an invisible but real *power*, to open and shut the kingdom of heaven in the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST ; a SPIRIT of never-failing *love* and *charity* to men’s souls, to guide us in the exercise of that more than human power ; and, lastly, a SPIRIT of kind and fatherly, yet, if need be, uncompromising and fearless *rebuke*.

Let us be only true to our sacred trust : let us put everything else by for the sake of handing down the whole counsel of GOD, our good deposit, entire as we received it : and who knows but we

<sup>1</sup> Δειλίας.

<sup>2</sup> Σωφρονισμοῦ.

may by God's mercy be made instrumental in saving the English church from ruin not unlike that which has fallen on Ephesus, Smyrna, or Sardis? At any rate, the Church Catholic, in one country or another, we are sure, will survive and triumph. As of old she has stood before kings and governors, and it turned to her for a testimony, so now blessed are they whom divine Providence shall choose and enable worthily to support her cause against popular delusion and tyranny. We, indeed, as Priests of the second order, are but under-labourers in that most holy cause. Yet the least and lowest among us may look for his share of the blessing, as he has undoubtedly his share of the burthen and of the peril. Is there not a hope, that by resolute self-denial and strict and calm fidelity to our ordination vows, we may not only aid in preserving that which remains, but also may help to revive in some measure, in this or some other portion of the Christian world, more of the system and spirit of the apostolical age? New truths, in the proper sense of the word, we neither can nor wish to arrive at. But the monuments of antiquity may disclose to our devout perusal much that will be to this age new, because it has been mislaid or forgotten; and we may attain to a light and clearness, which we now dream not of, in our comprehension of the faith and discipline of CHRIST. We may

succeed beyond what humanly appears possible in rekindling a primitive zeal among those who shall be committed to our charge. Even as Abraham, neglecting all earthly objects, “taught his children and his household after him, to keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment;” and one part of his reward was, that “God would not hide from Abraham the thing which he did<sup>1</sup> ;” another, that he was made the glorious and favoured instrument for transmitting divine truth through a fallen and corrupt age.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xviii. 17—19.

## APPENDIX.

---

### NOTE A, p. 11.

Philip. i. 15--18. The construction here adopted varies a little from that commonly received. It may be as well, therefore, briefly to state the exact import of it, and the grounds on which it is preferred. It supposes that the words, κηρύσσειν and καταγγέλλειν, are not used here in any technical or official sense, which might answer to the English word *preaching*, taken as in our version of the Bible, but that they represent the occasional though providential result of St. Paul's imprisonment having been made the subject of conversation at Rome. Some spoke of it as faithful Christians; others the Judaizers more especially, as jealous enemies of Christianity: both became in a certain sense heralds of CHRIST, the one sincerely and intentionally speaking the word, as he says just above, the more boldly for his bonds; the other occasionally, without any purpose of their own. Clearly the words will bear this construction. And the ancient interpreters unite in denying the applicability of St. Paul's expressions to heretical teaching. So Tertullian, adv.

Marcion, lib. v. c. 20, having quoted the passage from St. Paul, remarks, that "this was the natural place for excepting to the substance of the preaching complained of, had any variation of that kind been the cause of this great diversity of feeling. But the Apostle states the irregularity to exist in the motives and tempers of men only, not in their standards of mysterious doctrine. His manner of speaking shows that with whatever purpose they preached, it was one GOD whom they preached, and one CHRIST. 'Therefore,' he adds, 'it is nothing to me, whether in pretence or in truth CHRIST be preached;' because it was still the same who was preached, whether with pretended or with real faithfulness. It was in respect of their good faith in preaching that he used the phrase '*in truth*,' not in respect of the rule of doctrine itself, which they preached. For the rule was all the time one; but some had genuine, *i. e.* simple good faith in delivering it; others were too full of subtilties." Again, it appears that in St. Cyprian's time, some had argued from this passage of St. Paul in favour of allowing heretical baptism. St. Cyprian's reply is, "He was not speaking of heretics, nor of their baptism. We cannot show that he has here laid down any rule pertaining thereto. He was speaking of Christians walking, some disorderly, and contrary to Church discipline; some, through fear of GOD, preserving evangelical verity . . . Now, it is one thing for those within the Church to speak in the name of CHRIST; another thing for those without (*i. e.* heretics) to baptize in the name of CHRIST." Ep. ad Jubaian. p. 204, ed. Fell. comp. Firmilian, ad Cyprian. p. 226. See also S. Chrys. *in loco*, who agrees with the preceding Fathers in not interpreting the passage of heretics, but is more express than they in supposing, that it was some sort of formal preaching of which St.

Paul complains. It seems, however, a hard supposition, that any should have literally preached the truth of CHRIST, and exposed themselves to persecution, for the sake of exasperating the emperor against St. Paul. In this therefore, it may be excusable to depart from St. Chrysostom, and rather to understand *κηρύσσειν* and *καταγγέλλειν*, when applied to the adversaries, in a secondary sense, of the pains taken by them to spread the report of the Apostle's imprisonment, which they considered a check and discredit to the Gospel.

NOTE B, p. 15.

The validity of this conjecture may be best estimated by simply comparing the passage in the original with the preceding and subsequent verses:—

Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθύνῳ διάγοντες, στυγητοὶ, μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους.

Ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιланθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ΘΕΟΥ,

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλεον ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς,

διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως ΠΝΕΥ- ΜΑΤΟΣ ἈΓΙΟΥ,

οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως, διὰ ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν·

ἵνα, δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι,

κληρονόμοι γενώμεθα κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· καὶ περὶ τούτων βούλομαι σε διαβεβαιώσθαι, ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων προίστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευ- κότες τῷ ΘΕΩ.

## NOTE C, p. 17.

The only other notion of the παρακαταθήκη, or apostolical deposit, which can at all approve itself to one versed in Scripture language, is that which would explain it of *persons* rather than of *doctrines*; the flock which was given him, the souls committed to his charge: according to the use of the word in the Acts of the Apostles: "They *commended* their new converts to the LORD on whom they had believed;" and St. Paul "*commended* the Ephesian elders to GOD and the word of his grace."

But, besides the reasons above given for interpreting the place rather of doctrine, it may be asked whether the very form of expression, Keep the deposit, is such as would have been probably adopted, had pastoral duties been only or chiefly intended. It seems to cast upon the person so admonished rather too much of absolute responsibility, considering that, after all, the success of the pastoral care must depend chiefly on those who are the objects of it. In short, it is a mode of interpreting too much in unison with the overstrained exaggerated demands of our day; in which it has become a general custom to speak as if every thing depended on the personal qualities of the clergy; to blame them altogether for failure, and, in consequence, to attribute to them over much of the blessings, with which the ALMIGHTY from time to time may be pleased to visit His Church.

## NOTE D, p. 24.

Iren. adv. Hær. iii. 4. "Non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile est ab Ecclesia sumere; cum Apostoli, quasi in depositarium dives, plenissime in

eam contulerint omnia quæ sint veritatis : uti omnis, quicunque velit, sumat ex ea potum vitæ. Hæc est enim vitæ introitus; omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones . . . Quid autem si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis? Nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes Barbarorum, eorum qui in CHRISTUM credunt, sine charta vel atramento scriptam habentes per SPIRITUM in cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes. . . . Hanc fidem qui sine literis crediderunt, quantum ad sermonem nostrum, barbari sunt; quantum autem ad sententiam, et consuetudinem, et conversationem, propter fidem perquam sapientissimi sunt, et placent Deo, conversantes in omni iustitia et castitate et sapientia. Quibus si aliquis annuntiaverit ea quæ ab hæreticis adinventæ sunt, proprio sermone eorum colloquens, statim concludentes aures, longo longius fugient, ne audire quidem sustinentes blasphemum colloquium."

NOTE E, p. 29.

This is not said without recollection of such texts as St. John v. 49; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. But it is plain that both these passages speak of the *Scriptures of the Old Testament only*; and therefore, if understood exclusively, prove too much. The latter, indeed, adds a general remark on the use of *all* Scripture; that being, as it is, all alike divinely inspired, every part of it has its use, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; and must help to the perfection and entire furnishing of the man of God unto all good works. But St. Paul does not there affirm that all truths

necessary to salvation are contained in Scripture, any more than he affirms all to be contained in each separate portion of Scripture.

These being the passages commonly adduced to prove by Scripture the sufficiency of Scripture, and being evidently inadequate to the purpose, we cannot be very wrong in rather referring to Tradition, as for the Sacred Canon itself, so also for this rule concerning it ; That it contains or implies whatever points of faith are necessary to eternal salvation.

#### NOTE F, p. 31.

Not to travel at present beyond the writings of Irenæus himself, the following might be cited as passages clearly implying this doctrine. In b. ii. c. 46, he thus lays down the rule to be adopted in interpreting Scripture parables :—" A sound, and safe, and religious mind, and one really bent on truth :—whatsoever things God has left within our province, and subjected to our knowledge, those such a mind will diligently study to the uttermost, and in the same continually advance, by daily exercise rendering the acquisition of knowledge easy to itself. Now these things are, first, such as come under the cognizance of our sight ; secondly, whatsoever things are openly and unambiguously uttered in the very words of the Divine Scriptures. And therefore the parables, or dark passages, ought always to be expounded consistently with those which are clear." Is it not plain that Irenæus is here dividing the grounds of human knowledge into two classes, the one of Sight and the other of Faith ; and that his definition of the latter is, "such things as are openly and unambiguously uttered in the very words of Divine Scrip-

ture"? Presently after, he compares those who leave express Scripture for doubtful and fanciful theories of figurative language, to the foolish virgins, who "being freely and in plain terms invited to meet the bridegroom, lose their opportunity, and are shut out of the marriage feast, while they are seeking light from those who busy themselves in the dark with forced explanations of parables." Again, in the very passage above quoted, p. 24, where he speaks most highly of real apostolical tradition, he clearly intimates that the Scriptures are parallel to it in substance. The mere question, If we had not the Scriptures, must we not follow tradition? implies that, having the Scriptures, we have the substance of truths necessary to salvation, and so far depend not at all on tradition. The manner, again, in which Irenæus every where opposes the heretics to the Scriptures, evinces that they were constantly and unhesitatingly appealed to by the orthodox, as the foundation, without going further. E. g. lib. ii. c. 54. "These are not fitter guides than the Scriptures: nor does it become us, leaving the writings of the LORD and Moses, and the other prophets, heralds of the truth, to rest our faith on these, whose teaching has nothing sound, but is full of distraction and incoherency."

#### NOTE G, p. 35.

The following is the statement of St. Athanasius; de Decr. Nic. Synod. c. iii. : t. i. 210. ed. Bened.

Ὡς ἐφιλονείκουν ἀσεβοῦντες, καὶ θεομαχεῖν ἐπεχείρουν, τὰ μὲν λεγόμενα παρ' αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἦν μεστά· οἱ δὲ συνελθόντες ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν ἐκ πλείον ἢ ἑλασσον τριακόσιοι· πρῶως καὶ φιλανθρωπῶς ἀπήτουν αὐτοὺς, περὶ ὧν

ἔλεγον διδόναι λόγον καὶ ἀποδείξεις εὐσεβεῖς. ὥς δὲ καὶ μόνον φθεγγόμενοι κατεγινώσκοντο, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς διεμάχοντο, πολλὴν ὀρῶντες τῆς ἑαυτῶν αἰρέσεως τὴν ἀπορίαν, ἄχανεῖς μὲν ἔμενον οὗτοι, καὶ διὰ τῆς σιωπῆς ὁμολογουν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ κακοδοξίᾳ αὐτῶν αἰσχύνην· οἱ τοίνυν ἐπίσκοποι λοιπὸν ἀνελόντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπινοηθέντα ῥήματα, οὕτως ἐξέθεντο κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν ὑγιαίνουσιν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὴν πίστιν.

“The Arians being forward in their impiety, and taking the offensive, and uttering words full of ungodliness, the Bishops who had assembled, being in number three hundred, more or less, quietly asked of them to give some explanation and proof of their affirmations, consistent with piety. But when upon their own shewing they were convicted, and were at variance with each other, finding themselves much at a loss in maintaining their heresy, the result was, on the one part, silence, and an implied confession of shame for their perverse opinion; on the other, the Bishops rejected the expressions devised by them, and proceeded to enunciate against them the sound faith, *the faith of the Church from the beginning.*”

The orthodox therefore at Nice argued indeed largely from Scripture, but it was in refutation of the Arian subtilties, rather than for establishment of the Catholic faith. For the latter purpose, they were content to appeal to tradition.

#### NOTE H, p. 40.

Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants*, c. vii. p. 1. s. 56. “The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Whatever else they believe besides it, and the plain irrefragable indubitable consequences

of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion : but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe in themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, *Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age ; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found. No tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering men to build upon.*" It is melancholy, but instructive, to reflect that the writer of these sentences is known to have been " sceptical, to say the least of it, on the highest points of faith." Clarendon's Life, i. 56. See Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works, i. 66, 67. Des Maizeaux, Life of Chillingworth, 55.

NOTE I, p. 48.

The sort of improvement which we are encouraged to hope for, is traced out by Vincentius Lirinensis, Commonitor. c. 22 :—" O Timothee, O sacerdos, O trac-tator, O doctor, si te divinum munus idoneum fecerit, ingenio, exercitatione, doctrina, esto spiritalis tabernaculi

Bezaleel, pretiosas divini dogmatis gemmas exsculpe, fideliter coapta, adorna sapienter, adjice splendorem, gratiam, venustatem. Intelligatur te exponente illustrius quod ante obscurius credebatur. Per te posteritas intellectum gratuletur, quod ante vetustas non intellectum venerabatur. Eadem tamen quæ didicisti doce; ut cum dicas nove, non dicas nova." Compare Bp. Butler, Anal. part ii. c. iii. vol. ii. p. 249. Oxford, 1807.

NOTE K, p. 51.

This part of the argument can hardly be stated, under the present circumstances of our Church, without giving rise to the grave practical question, What is the line to be taken by those clergymen, who feel serious objections, in conscience and principle, to the course of ecclesiastical legislation now in progress: who consider our SAVIOUR'S charter to be violated by the admission of a body constituted as the British Parliament now is to legislate for the Church of CHRIST, especially without controul or authority from the Bishops synodically assembled? Under such persuasion, can we help regarding the laws so passed, or hereafter to be passed, as having in themselves no canonical force, and only then claiming the submission of CHRIST'S ministers and people, when enforced on us severally by command of our respective diocesans? Or can we avoid entertaining fears, that the whole may amount in GOD'S sight to the concurrence of the Church in a great national sin? All this, over and above the many grave exceptions which, as not a few of us think, may reasonably be alleged against the *details* of the proposed reform. Can it be wrong to take such opportunities as we have of respectfully recording our humble but

deliberate protest against proceedings, in our judgment so very objectionable ?

The present writer is well aware of the insignificancy of such expressions of individual opinion ; and also of the danger of appearing undutiful to those whom he is bound most on earth to honour and revere. But he has observed in several quarters a disposition to interpret the silence of the parochial clergy as implying approbation of the measures in question : and he fears that such supposed acquiescence may tend to neutralize our efforts on future occasions. These feelings, he hopes, may plead his excuse for being anxious to disavow on his own behalf, and as far as he may venture to do so, on behalf of the clergy in general, all responsibility on the subject. The principles, on which we might well be supposed averse to the course which has been adopted, were sufficiently manifested three years ago in our remonstrances against the Irish Church Bill. Whatever has been now done, for good or for evil, the praise or blame of it must belong entirely to our governors. Our part has been merely that of soldiers, laying down their arms at the command of their superior officers. Nor can it in fairness be so construed as to preclude us hereafter from asserting church principles, as often as we feel that our duty calls on us to do so.



## POSTSCRIPT

TO THE

### THIRD EDITION.

---

TRADITION is a word of so vague use, and so closely associated, in most men's minds, with a whole host of partialities and antipathies, that it were chimerical to think of escaping objections, though a person's view on the subject were much clearer and more accurate than the author of the preceding Sermon professes to have attained. This consideration ought *in limine* to check any thought of bitterness, such as is apt to spring up in a writer's mind, when he finds himself charged with opinions which he knows he never held, and believes he never expressed: and at the same time it may console him under the fear, which he must more or less experience, lest something incautious or negligent in his way of writing may have led to such misrepresentation, and so may have injured what he conscientiously believes to be a most important and sacred cause. As it is, he may perhaps be excused for waiving any detailed notice of the censures with which the sermon has been visited; not out of any disrespect to their authors, but under the sincere conviction, that the subsequent remarks, if duly followed up, will explain and justify, to

considerate persons, whatever may have appeared questionable in the original argument.

On a general view of what he has read and heard in opposition to the idea of Church Tradition here enforced, he finds matter, *first*, for serious protest on his own behalf, and, *secondly*, for serious caution to all who approach that subject.

I. 1. He is principally anxious to remove any impression which may exist of his wishing to recommend a new theory, a rule of faith devised for present occasions, by any particular school of divines, now or at any former time. On the contrary, he is persuaded that what he is endeavouring to inculcate is no other than the very rule of the Church of England, as distinguished on the one hand from Romish usurpation, on the other from rationalistic licentiousness. And in support of this persuasion he appeals to the collection of authorities concerning Tradition, from the standard English divines, under the title of *Catena Patrum*; which is subjoined to this reprint of the Sermon, by permission of the Editor of the *Tracts for the Times*. If he err in his estimate of the spirit of the English Church, it will appear, he trusts, by those papers, that at least his error was not of his own invention—that he has both high and ancient authority for it.

With this reference the topic of novelty might be dismissed; but there is one great name occurring in the *Catena*, to the benefit of which some may deny that the argument has a full right: and as there are appearances to the contrary, a few words may be allowed in explanation. The name meant is that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor; in one of whose latest sermons; a sermon addressed to his clergy during his episcopate, the following occurs among the rules for securing incorruption of doctrine:

“Next to this analogy or proportion of faith, let the consent of the Catholic Church be your measure, so as by no means to prevaricate in any doctrine, in which all Christians always have consented. This will appear to be a necessary rule by and by; but in the mean time I shall observe to you, that it will be the safer, because it cannot go far; it can be instanced but in three things, in the *Creed*, in *ecclesiastical government*, and in external *forms of worship and liturgy*. The Catholic Church hath been too much and too soon divided: it hath been used as the man upon a hill used his heap of heads in a basket; when he threw them down the hill, every head ran his own way, ‘quot capita tot sententiæ;’ and as soon as the spirit of truth was opposed by the spirit of error, the spirit of peace was disordered by the spirit of division; and the SPIRIT of God hath overpowered us so far, that we are only fallen out about that, of which if we had been ignorant, we had not been much the worse; but in things simply necessary, God hath preserved us still unbroken; all nations and all ages recite the Creed, and all pray the Lord’s Prayer, and all pretend to walk by the rule of the Commandments, and all churches have ever kept the day of CHRIST’s resurrection or the LORD’s day holy; and all churches have been governed by Bishops, and the rites of Christianity have been for ever administered by separate orders of men, and those men have been always set apart by prayer and the imposition of the Bishop’s hands; and all Christians have been baptized, and all baptized persons were, or ought to be, and were taught that they should be, confirmed by the Bishop, and presidents of religion; and for ever there were public forms of prayer, more or less, in all churches; and all Christians that were to enter into holy wedlock were ever joined or blessed by the Bishop or the Priest: in these

things all Christians have ever consented, and *he that shall prophesy or expound Scripture to the prejudice of any of these things, hath no part in that article of his Creed ; he does not believe the holy Catholic Church, he hath no fellowship, no communion with the saints and servants of GOD*<sup>1</sup>.”

In the *Dissuasive from Popery*, a work of the same date, he says, “ The great use of the Fathers, especially of the first three hundred years, is to tell us what was first, to consign Scripture to us, to convey the creed, with simplicity and purity to preach CHRIST’S Gospel, to declare what is necessary and what not<sup>2</sup>.” Again, in the *Ductor Dubitantium*, “ There is yet one more use of Tradition, but it is in rituals, . . . Such are, 1. The observation of the LORD’S day, solemnly once a year, and less solemnly once a week ; i. e. the feast of Easter, and the weekly Sunday ; 2. The government of the Church by Bishops, which is consigned to us by a tradition greater than some books of Scripture, and as great as that of the LORD’S day ; and that so notorious, that thunder is not more heard than this is seen in all the monuments of antiquity ; 3. Offices ecclesiastical to be said and done by ecclesiastical persons ; such as are, the public prayers of the Church, the consecration of the blessed Eucharist, the blessing of the married pairs and joining them in the holy and mysterious rite of marriage, the consecration of Bishops by Bishops only, &c. These three are the most universal and apostolical Traditions ; which, although they have also great grounds in Scripture, yet because the universal practice and doctrine of the Church of GOD in all ages and in all churches primitive is infinitely evident and notorious, less liable to

<sup>1</sup> Vol. vi. p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. x. p. 312.

exception, and an apt commentary upon the certain but less evident places of Scripture, therefore these may be placed under the protection of universal tradition; for they really have it beyond all exception<sup>1</sup>.”

Passages of this kind (and many more might be adduced) would seem to show that when Bishop Taylor speaks in disparagement of tradition, he means only such as the Church of Rome avouches: tradition of the *substance* of doctrine, *independent of Scripture*, and *purporting to be of things necessary to salvation*. For the *form* of doctrine, i. e. for the creed, or selection of fundamental articles; for *ritual* matters; and for *Church government*, he accounts it not only useful, but (morally and practically speaking) necessary. And he repeatedly and distinctly assigns the reason for the different degree of authority which he attributes to it in the two cases; viz. that in practical matters it may be verified, but in doctrinal (with the exception of the creed) it cannot. If it could, his own statement is, it ought to be received on the same ground as the Scriptures, the distinction of written and spoken being but an accident<sup>2</sup>.

Now in all this it will be difficult to show in what instance Bp. Taylor's doctrine varies from that of the preceding Sermon, except it be in these two particulars; which do

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 118.

<sup>2</sup> x. 418. “Tradition signified either preaching or writing, as it happened. When it signified preaching, it was only the first way of communicating the religion of JESUS CHRIST; and until the Scriptures were written, and consigned by the full testimony of the Apostles and apostolical churches respectively, they, in questions of religion, usually appealed to tradition.” Then quoting the passage of St. Irenæus, which is cited in the preceding sermon, he adds, “That which was true then, is also true now; for, if the Apostles had never written at all, we must have followed tradition; unless God had provided for us some better thing.” Comp. p. 385.

not, it is conceived, affect the main argument: first, that the Sermon mentions *Interpretation of Scripture* as another possible field of genuine tradition, besides those which Taylor has specified; and, secondly, that although Taylor, in a passage above cited, appears to make certain traditional practices absolutely necessary to church communion, yet in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, a work of an earlier date by a few years, he had followed up his mention of the same observances thus: "Whatever can descend to us and be observed in this channel, there is no sufficient reason to deny it to be apostolical; but then how far it can be obligatory to all ages and to all churches will be another consideration<sup>1</sup>." On comparing the two statements, it may perhaps be thought that this great man, like his predecessor Hooker, as he grew older, became more convinced of the importance as well as genuineness of those portions of the Church system, which are most concerned in this controversy<sup>2</sup>. And it may be observed, that any admission from him, apparently narrowing the terms of communion, comes to us with peculiar force; his tendency, as the *Liberty of Prophesying* shows, being quite the other way;

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 139.

<sup>2</sup> "It is something in favour of Vincentius' rule, that it has been received, extolled, and acted upon, by such men as Ridley, Jewel, Grotius, Overal, Hammond, Beveridge, Bull, Hicks, Bramhall, Grabe, Cave, and our own Archbishop King; that it has been admitted expressly even by Chillingworth; and that it has been unreservedly acknowledged as a just and true guide, by Bishop Taylor, in one of his latest works, his Visitation Sermon at Connor; a tribute, this last, the more remarkable, because in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, and in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, he had spoken less respectfully of the principle, and his remarkable change of language can be accounted for only by his having undergone a correspondent change of sentiment. He had seen, felt, and weighed every difficulty; the result of all was, a deliberate persuasion that Vincentius was right, and that he himself had been wrong." Bishop Jebb, *Letter* liii. Forster's *Life*, ii. 249.

indulgent and liberal (as many will judge) to a fault, and not well brooking the austere denunciations of some even of the primitive creeds.

On the whole we need not have much hesitation in adding the name of Bishop Taylor to the illustrious cloud of witnesses for Primitive Tradition, which the ensuing pages will present to the reader.

It is in behalf of their constant doctrine, and not of any modern invention, that the writer desires further to protest against certain undue assumptions, on which, as it appears to him, is based nearly the whole of the reasoning of the deniers of Primitive Tradition.

2. Because it is affirmed that the full tradition of Christianity existed before the Christian Scriptures, and so far independent of them, we are charged with alleging two distinct systems or words of GOD, the one written, the other unwritten, running as it were parallel to each other quite down to our own time. But this, by the terms of the case, is plainly unwarranted. If a man were to say that the Severn and the Wye rise separately in the same mountain, one higher up than the other, must he therefore maintain that they never meet before they reach the sea? Tradition and Scripture were at first two streams flowing down from the mountain of GOD, but their waters presently became blended, and it were but a vain and unpractical inquiry, to call upon every one who drinks of them to say, how much of the healing draught came from one source, and how much from the other. On account of those who would poison the stream, it is necessary from time to time to analyse it, and show that it contains no ingredients which were not to be found in one or other of the two fountains; and in so doing, it becomes incidentally manifest, at least in some measure, what portion each of the

two has contributed to the general mass; it is manifest, for example, that all necessary *credenda*, all truths essential to salvation, are contained in the Scripture itself; and is it not equally manifest, that many helps of the greatest consequence, nay I will say generally necessary, to the right development and application of Scripture, are mostly if not entirely derivable from tradition? And is it not a poor kind of reasoning to say, Tradition would have been worthless had we been left to it alone, therefore it cannot be of any value, now that Scripture has been all along at hand, to check, to sustain, to interpret, to rectify it, as the several occasions might require? Yet this is the whole substance of many men's argumentation on the subject: they have argued against an imaginary case, instead of addressing themselves to the realities of Church history; and have thus given an advantage to Romanists on one side and Rationalists on the other, of which neither party has been slow to avail itself. Such is not the way of the English Church; she does not so violently sever the different parts of the constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven, but acknowledging Scripture as her written charter, and Tradition as the common law, whereby both the validity and practical meaning of that charter is ascertained, venerates both as inseparable members of one great providential system; without confounding their provinces, or opposing them to each other, in the manner of modern Rome. Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that persons should be found among her members and ministers desirous to follow, as God shall give them grace, in so plain, so reasonable, so moderate, so safe a way? Because they call attention to the fact, that "*Primitive tradition is recognized in Holy Scripture,*" as being, AT THAT TIME, of paramount authority; why should they be presently

suspected of having a system of their own in reserve; a theory, like some parts of Romanism, *still* independent of Holy Scripture, and to be supported by *modern* traditions? more especially if they themselves are careful to declare and exemplify the use they wish to make of the fact in question; viz. to illustrate and enforce, by its aid, certain portions of the *existing Church system*, which they consider to be especially in danger.

3. I say, of the *existing Church system*, here in England: for this is another point on which some protest seems to be required. For it is assumed that the traditions and practices, which the Sermon has most in view, are "obscure and obsolete<sup>1</sup>;" and that where persons are called on to search in antiquity for genuine relics of the Apostles, "the question of course concerns those points which are not embodied in our own formularies<sup>2</sup>." In assuming this, the fact is overlooked, that in the very page of the sermon here referred to, the chief points in question are specified; "being such as these: the canon of Scripture; the full doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; the oblation and consecration of the Eucharist; the apostolical Succession:" to which, perhaps, it might have been well to add the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration. Surely it is not too much to say, that these points are "embodied in our own formularies;" and, if there be any of them about which the clergy are unhappily not agreed, it is not too much to hope, that in so far as the right use of tradition may clear up what is ambiguous, whether in those formularies or in Scripture itself, it may give some

<sup>1</sup> *Observations on Primitive Tradition*, &c., by the Rev. Thos. Butt, p. 14. Compare p. 56, 62—64.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Wilson's *Brief Examination*, &c. p. 36.

help towards bringing us to a better agreement. This is the very chiefest advantage which the warmest recommenders of tradition in our Church expect from it; viz. that attention to it should very much elevate men's ideas of the existing system, proving it divine in many points where they now ignorantly suppose it human. This, and not the establishment of any mere theory, new or old, is the immediate object of those who have most earnestly urged, from time to time, the reverential study of Christian antiquity. Not that they would entirely shut out the hope of improvement in many respects: thankfully as they own that God has preserved to us all things on which the being of a Church depends, they yet feel that much is wanting—more, probably, than can ever be supplied,—of the perfect order and harmony of the apostolical age. Nor do they feel it any breach of fidelity to the Church of England, to join in the confession of one on whom she has ever prided herself, as among her truest children and chiefest ornaments:

“ The second Temple could not reach the first,  
And the late Reformation never durst  
Compare with ancient times and purer years,  
But, in the Church and us, deserveth tears.”

4. It may be well to protest, once for all, against the allegation so confidently repeated concerning the Sixth Article of the Church of England, as against the claims of primitive tradition<sup>1</sup>. To apprehend the drift of that Article exactly, it must be considered as chiefly intended for a guide to the clergy: and will be found in that light

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Butt's *Observations*, &c., p. 4; Dr. Wilson's *Brief Examination*, p. 12.

exactly to correspond with the engagement in the Ordination and Consecration Services, to “*teach* nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which we shall be persuaded may be *concluded* and *proved* by the Scripture ;” as being “persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all *doctrine* required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in JESUS CHRIST.” A comparison of the two documents will tend to show how carefully they are limited to matters of *doctrine*, *articles of faith*, *propositions*, the *belief* of which may be deemed fundamental and indispensable. Not that Scripture is not divinely perfect as a rule of life and manners also ; but the framers of the Article were not at the time turning their attention that way : they wished to be understood of necessary points of *faith*, *doctrinal* conditions of admission into CHRIST’S covenant. Observe the wording of that clause, where they compare the canonical with the apocryphal books. “The other books the Church doth read *for example of life and instruction of manners*, but yet doth not apply them *to establish any doctrine*.”

Thus the Article leaves ample scope for the province, which, as we have seen, Bishop Taylor assigned principally to tradition : practical rules relating to the Church of CHRIST. For any thing stated in the Article, such rules might be both divine, and generally necessary to salvation, and yet not be contained in Scripture ; but the doctrines or propositions concerning them would not be necessary : it would be wrong to insert them as Articles of the Creed. For instance, St. Ignatius writes as follows<sup>1</sup> : “Let that Eucharist be accounted valid which is under the Bishop, or some one commissioned by him.”

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Smyrn. c. viii.*

Wherein he lays down the rule, which we know was universally received in the Primitive Church, that consecration by apostolical authority is essential to the participation of the Eucharist, and so far generally necessary to salvation. Now supposing this could not be at all proved from Scripture (as it may, in a great measure, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds) still it might be accepted, on the above evidence, as a necessary rule of Church communion, without infringing on our Sixth Article: but it could not be turned into a proposition, and put into the Creed, because that would make not only the rule itself, as observed by the Church, but the knowledge of it also by the individual, necessary to salvation: and it may be thankfully admitted, that knowledge of the true nature of Sacraments is nowhere required in holy Scripture<sup>1</sup>, as a condition of our receiving the spiritual grace they impart.

Neither again does the Article say any thing derogatory to the divinely appointed<sup>2</sup> use of primitive tradition, (i. e. of the Creeds of the Church,) in pointing out which among scriptural truths are fundamental, and ought to be made terms of communion: rather it implies an appeal to such tradition, allowing, as it does expressly, that there may be fundamental truths, the premises whereof only are contained in Scripture, and not the very propositions themselves; which allowance would throw the terms of communion into no small uncertainty, were it not for the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 29. is no exception to this; since *διακρίνων* means rather "reverent separation" (from common bread) than "accurate knowledge and discernment" in the modern sense. And compare the inspired narrative, St. Matth. ix. 20, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. i. 8.

Article next but one directing attention especially to the three Creeds, as adequate to supply what the former Article had left wanting; and both together completing the rule of faith; the Creeds presenting the conclusions to be believed, the Scripture confirming them out of the mouth of God.

Moreover, the principle itself of the sufficiency of Scripture is mainly a traditional principle; although when once put in possession of it, we find it irresistibly confirmed by contemplation of the contents of the written Word. But on this subject it were presumptuous to do more than refer the reader to the masterly discussion by Mr. Newman, in the 11th, 12th, and 13th of his lately published Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. One question only shall be added. Do we not discern, on this hypothesis, a very beautiful and instructive harmony between the several provinces of evangelical teaching? the preliminary principle, the sufficiency of the written Word, being taught by tradition and confirmed and illustrated by the Bible, just in the same way as the several doctrines are afterwards. And is not this analogy, as far as it goes, both a material confirmation of the general statement, and also an indication of the purpose of moral probation, which we may believe was one final cause of the whole arrangement? just as, under God's natural government, our probation is the more entire from the circumstance, that we receive our first impressions from Testimony, but must use Observation to confirm or correct them, and cannot long depend upon either quite alone.

Now since we are bound to receive the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense, this construction might be fairly maintained, whatever were the known sentiments of

those who at first imposed them; but the argument for it becomes more forcible, when it is recollected that the same convocation, which first enforced subscription on the clergy, passed also the following canon for the regulation of preaching throughout the kingdom: "That the clergy shall be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, *and collected out of that very same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.*" This canon, passed 1571, under the auspices of Archbishop Parker, has been often quoted, (among others, repeatedly by Bishop Taylor <sup>1</sup>), as expressing the genuine, permanent sense of the Anglican Church on the matters in question. And it seems fair and natural that it should be so quoted, as often as we are asked on what authority, and by whose warrant, our clergy can be called upon to walk by the rule of primitive antiquity, rather than by their own private judgment.

5. As to any suspicion which may have arisen about limiting primitive tradition to mere formularies <sup>2</sup>, and ministerial faithfulness to the investigation and custody of the traditional safeguards of faith only <sup>3</sup>: such suspicion must vanish, of course, when it is once well understood that the "depositum" so much insisted on *includes* to us the written Word, as in the first age it doubtless included the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is the whole "orthodox faith;" the whole "Creed of the Apostolical Church, as guaranteed to us by holy Scripture, and by

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, x. 131, 322, 404.

<sup>2</sup> *Brief Examination*, p. 14, 15, 24, 27, 29, 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 33, 51.

consent of pure antiquity." (The writer hopes to be excused for quoting his own words; but he really does not know how to express himself more clearly.) Still, that in the first age there were Creeds and Catechisms, and that the apostolical writings sometimes allude to them, he must still take the liberty of believing: being strengthened in his interpretation by the witness of Bishop Taylor, who, speaking of the Apostles' Creed as "having been always in the Primitive Church esteemed a full and perfect digest of all the necessary and fundamental Articles of Christian religion<sup>1</sup>," goes on to say: "St. Paul gave us the first formal intimation of this measure, in his advices to St. Timothy: 'Hold fast the form of sound words<sup>2</sup> which thou hast heard of me in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.' This was the *depositum* that St. Paul left with Timothy; the *hypotyposis* or summary of Christian belief, the Christian Creed, which St. Paul opposes to the profane new talkings, and the disputations of pretended learning; meaning that this symbol of faith is the thing on which all Christians are to rely, and this is the measure of their faith." Surely it were unfair, on account of such a sentence as this, to accuse Bishop Taylor of shutting up either the Apostles' teaching, or the trust committed to their successors, in one scanty form of words. It is not the

<sup>1</sup> x. 458.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Taylor here gives the interpretation of this phrase most approved among moderns. The turn given to it in the Sermon, p. 18, being rather different, it may be right just to mention the reasons of the difference; which are: 1. the want of the definitive article in the Greek: ἔχε ὑποτύπωσιν, not ἔχε τὴν ὑ. 2. The mode of paraphrase adopted by the ancients, especially Chrysostom and Theodoret. Elsewhere Bishop Taylor expounds τύπον διδαχῆς in Rom. vi. 17. as conveying a like allusion. x. 129.

form of words, but the substantial truths, which are meant, when people speak of our still having the Primitive Creed, and of its exclusive vital importance to the very being of the kingdom of heaven. Neither, should it appear at any time requisite to urge on the clergy, as their paramount care, the integrity of doctrinal faith, is this necessarily any disparagement of practical religion, of pastoral vigilance, or of any other of their objects and duties.

II. Thus much by way of protecting the scriptural argument for Primitive Tradition against certain misapprehensions under which it appeared to labour. It may be well to add a few *cautionary* remarks, obvious enough, yet not always regarded by those who take an interest in this subject.

1. We should be careful that we are not, unknown to ourselves, expecting *demonstration*, where *practical proof* only is attainable and ought to be sufficient. Somewhat of this error appears to lurk in those minds, which reject the notion of a rule of faith made up of Scripture and tradition together, on the ground that Scripture is infallible, tradition merely historical. They appear to reason as if there could be no faith without demonstrative infallible evidence. The truer statement surely would be, that such evidence, complete in all its parts, leaves no room for faith; and therefore we are nowhere left to such evidence alone. Is it not so, that in regard of those truths the evidence whereof is most entirely scriptural, we are yet to depend on common historical proof both for the genuineness and the right interpretation of the text? And as the stream can rise no higher than the fountain, so our assent even to scriptural truths differs not from our assent to other well-attested historical propositions, so far as the kind of evidence is concerned. The great point in which it does differ is the deep feeling of awe and reverential attention with which it

is naturally accompanied, from the very circumstance that GOD himself, as we have reason to believe, is speaking from heaven to assure us of these things. Now as far as we have reason to consider any traditional or ecclesiastical rule as being in effect the voice of GOD, so far we shall naturally treat it (the substance of it) with the same *kind* of reverence as we should treat both the substance and the very words of a text from the Bible. For instance, could we be once fully satisfied that the order of consecration of the Holy Eucharist, such as it is gathered out of the Primitive Liturgies<sup>1</sup>, was established by the Apostles under the guidance of the HOLY GHOST, we should be affected by it much as we are by the apostolical writings themselves; *i. e.* with reverence inferior only to that with which we regard our LORD's own words in the Gospel. Suppose we are not fully satisfied on the point, but only discern a strong probability, sufficient for a wise man to act on; yet surely we are bound, if circumstances allow, to act on it with all devotion: and our doing so will be an exercise of faith, and may humbly hope for the reward of faith. This instance may serve to show that the distinction alluded to is not valid, since on the one hand, scriptural evidence must always presuppose a foundation in

<sup>1</sup> On this subject the argument of the Sermon is much indebted to Mr. Russell, who in his Remarks on it, p. 19, meaning to object to the statement, That without the Liturgies we could not be sure that we bless and consecrate as the Apostles did, affirms, and in good measure proves, that "for some centuries it was deemed sufficient to the consecration to use in substance the words which our SAVIOUR himself used when he instituted the LORD's Supper." (Of course he implies, what the same Liturgies also prove, that the person consecrating must be a Bishop or Priest, and that there was first a solemn prayer for the appropriate blessing of this great mystery.) But how does he prove his statement? From the very Liturgies, the evidence of which he would dispense with.

that which is historical; and on the other hand, historical or traditional evidence may lead us back to a point so very near the Throne of GOD, as to require of us something of the same *kind* of feeling as if we heard Him speaking in Scripture.

2. Closely allied to this caution is another, too apt to be forgotten by both extremes in this controversy: Not to speak or argue as though we had any right, *a priori*, to expect full satisfaction and comfort here in our religious enquiries. Who are we, that *our* satisfaction, *our* comfort and ease of mind, should be the regulating point (if one may so call it) of the machinery of GOD's dispensations? the index whereby to determine in what measure and degree the Almighty shall have revealed Himself to His creatures? Yet this is virtually premised, both in the schools of Rome, when they argue that there must be on earth an infallible judge of controversies, otherwise the Church will be left in comparative discomfort; and also by those Protestants who account tradition inadmissible, because it is, as they judge, always more or less "uncertain and slippery;" who seem to think that nothing can be, practically, an object of faith, except what is "very distinct in character, clear in its credentials, well authenticated in its details;" and who consider it a sufficient objection to an account of a mystery, that it leaves the nature of the transaction dubious, and admits of no clear statement<sup>1</sup>. Experience shows that there is too much

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Wilson, *Brief Examination*, &c. p. 20, 35, 55, 56. Compare the following statement of Mr. Butt: "It is of no practical benefit to imagine . . . the impossible case (*impossible if God's Providence orders all things for the good of his Church*) of the Scriptures never having been written, or having perished with so many other monuments of antiquity." *Observations*, &c. p. 42. And consider, on the other side, that "We are not

danger, lest the enemy take advantage of this longing after completeness and clearness, to turn men aside, ingenious men especially, from the strait and narrow and sometimes broken way, towards some path of human framing, more enticing to such minds, because it seems distincter in its end, better defined and more continuous in its course. But clearness and symmetry of doctrine are a dear purchase, when Christian truth and duty must be impaired for their sake. After all, a fragment of the true Temple is worth all the palaces of modern philosophical theology.

One ill effect of the tone of mind just mentioned, and one which is very little suspected by the parties themselves, is this, that it sets them on limiting our enquiries and opinions more strictly than the Church does: they seem to themselves to move in such fulness of light, that they become after a time quite impatient to see others feeling their way, walking as in twilight, and betraying more or less uncertainty: they little suspect that, perhaps, all the while, they may be but "walking in the light of their own fire, and in the sparks which themselves have kindled," while the others may be gradually learning to "trust in the name of the LORD, and stay upon their GOD<sup>1</sup>." However, in the state of things which the holy Prophet here describes, those who seem to themselves illuminated become after a time, as was said, impatient of the caution and comparative timidity of the others, and are wont to interfere, more or less rudely, to force or

in any sort able to judge, whether it were to have been expected that the revelation should have been committed to writing, or left to be handed down, and consequently corrupted, by verbal tradition, and at length sunk under it, if mankind so pleased." Bishop Butler, *Anal.* p. ii. c. 3. p. 240. Oxford, 1807.

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah l. 10.

frighten them into their own way. Is it not from some impression of this kind, that among the persons who are most averse to tradition, on this express ground, that they require things to be distinct and certain, are those who would tie us down most strictly to the very letter of the Homilies? although it is most clear from the wording of the 35th Article, that the recommendation of them to the Church by authority was but general as to their substance, and bore express reference to that particular time<sup>1</sup>. Nay, and the matter has been carried so far as to demand rejection, at the hands of the clergy, of all that is (not “inconsistent with,” but) “unauthorised by” the Thirty-nine Articles<sup>2</sup>: as if the Articles were either a rule of faith, or a complete system of theology; as if they were in any sense conditions of lay communion; as if the Liturgy added nothing to the declaration of the mind of the Church of England; or as if, on the other hand, it were impossible to urge any thing as vitally important, without setting it forth as a formal condition of Church communion, nay, even of final salvation<sup>3</sup>.

3. But the cardinal point, on which, it would seem, all men require warning, from beginning to end of these discussions, is *the irreverent use of reason*. There is continual danger of our treating as profane what, for ought we know, may be sacred, though not as yet proved to be so; danger of slighting divine mysteries because we cannot comprehend or explain them; danger of forfeiting divine grace, because, being unable to trace its workings, we will not be at the trouble of seeking it. Even in the course of the brief controversy which the present Sermon has occa-

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Jebb, *Practical Theology*, ii. 283, &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Brief Examination*, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 56.

sioned, some remarkable facts have occurred, to strengthen the impression which all Church history would make, as to the ill tendencies inseparable from disregard of antiquity.

For example, in answer to the allegation, that our assurance of the spiritual interpretation of Solomon's Song depends mainly on a constant tradition of the early Church, it is replied that a spiritual interpretation is, from the evidence "of the book itself, the only one that is consistent with its canonicity<sup>1</sup>." What is this but expressly submitting the Canon of Scripture, so far, to each man's private taste and judgment? what is it but laying down rules before-hand what inspired writings ought to be? At this very time, in regard of this very book, we see the effect of such licentious discussion; the most distinguished living theologian among dissenters having refused to accept it as part of the sacred Scripture, on the ground that *he cannot see* how it may be expounded in any sense which *he considers* worthy of a divine origin<sup>2</sup>. The opponent of tradition, indeed, goes on to say, that "we are scripturally led to interpret the Canticles as we do the 45th Psalm, and many similar portions of Scripture." But how are we so led? Not by any reference in the New Testament, for the book is not once cited or alluded to, but by analogy of several passages in which the same kind of allegory is employed. Now how do we know that we have a right to assume such an analogy here? Scripture itself does not affirm it. Reason is not so positive about it, but that many distinguished interpreters have laid down a rule inconsistent with such an application of it—the rule, namely,

<sup>1</sup> *Ch. Observer*, May, 1837, p. 328.

<sup>2</sup> *Scripture Testim. to the Messiah*, i. 46. ed. 2.

that nothing must be received as a type, without <sup>1</sup> “*solid proof*” from Scripture itself” of “the Divine intention in the correspondence between it and the antitype.” The most that we can attain to, on such premises, is to say that the book may be *possibly* canonical (i. e. if history is right in saying that it made part of the Jewish Scriptures at the time when our LORD set his seal on them) ; but on the interpretation of it we must be absolutely silent, for the literal meaning is pronounced unworthy of Scripture, and, concerning any other, nothing is revealed. Nor would this be incredible to such as are convinced that we are in no sort judges before-hand, what sort of a book Scripture was likely to be, how far intelligible at all, how far its own interpreter : but to those who have made up their minds that it must be “a volume which may be understood,” and understood “without traditional aid <sup>2</sup>,” the case is too likely to prove matter of serious offence. The more comfortable, surely, as well as the more religious way is, to accept, with all reverence, whatever intimations God has graciously vouchsafed for aiding our conviction, both of the genuineness and of the right exposition of the sacred books. Let us ask of those to whom Scripture was first delivered, those who had the means of consulting inspired persons as to the meaning of obscure places. We shall find these agreeing in the following rule of interpretation : That the types and figures which the New Testament expressly notices out of the Old, are but a few out of many, specimens or ensamples, as it were, of the manner in which the HOLY GHOST wills us to regard the whole of the former dispensation. This gives us just what

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Van Mildert, as quoted in Horne’s *Introduction*, ii. 724.

<sup>2</sup> *Ch. Obs.* ubi supra.

we want: authority for applying the imagery which we find in the forty-fifth Psalm and elsewhere, to the exposition of the similar imagery in Solomon's Song; although the two differ in this material point, that the one is formally quoted in the New Testament, the other not even obscurely alluded to. When we take into consideration the witness of the first ages, we feel that this sacred application rests no longer on our own critical conjectures, but upon fair practical evidence, that men of God so taught in the beginning of the Gospel.

To this it will be presently said, You are claiming the sanction of inspiration to all the extravagancies of the early mystical expounders. And it may be as shortly replied, We are doing no such thing: we claim attention to the fact, that a certain *rule* of interpretation was recognised by those, who could not, all things considered, be deceived in the matter; but it does not follow that in their *application* of the rule they were left in no measure to their own fallible judgment. The principle, that Scripture is sufficient for the substance of the faith, is a sacred principle, and infallibly, i. e. certainly, true, without any kind of exception; yet men may err, and have erred, in *their selection* of fundamentals out of Scripture. So in this matter of primitive exposition; we may receive with respect, nay with awe, the rule of regarding the New Testament quotations as ensamples only of the true way to interpret the Old, without at all claiming infallibility for the details of any comment, professing to be founded on that rule.

Not but that, in some instances, the catholic consent, even on details of interpretation, is so marked and unquestionable, and comes with so much authority, as to justify us in concluding that besides the general rule regarding

all types, they had a special witness from the first age to the meaning of the HOLY GHOST in those particular texts. A prominent case of that kind is the allegorical application of the Canticles: concerning the proof of which from antiquity, whoever permits himself to speak lightly, had better take care lest he be found slighting a very gracious providence of God, for the protection of a portion of His word, peculiarly exposed to the rudeness of the scorner. Such an one will perhaps do well to consider, whether he be going the true way to encourage, in himself or in others, veneration for the Bible.

4. This instance has been dwelt on the longer, as peculiarly apt to confirm and illustrate the position, "that the Holy Scriptures themselves may be fast losing reverence through the resolute defiance of tradition which some affect." And is there not ground to apprehend the like with regard to the Holy Sacraments also? What but a too exclusive jealousy of tradition could have prevented the writer of the sentence noted below<sup>1</sup> from perceiving that it sounds as if he were disavowing all serious interest in the subjects there enumerated? a disavowal which, of course, was very far from his thoughts. And what shall we say to the following sentences, relating to the same Holy Mysteries? "The medium between affirming transubstantiation and denying the Presence, it seems, is believing a miracle. But what is this miracle? Is the nature and character of it left so dubious, both by Scripture and Tradition too, that nothing more can be said, while the demand is enforced,

<sup>1</sup> *Brief Examination*, &c. p. 43. "Those who feel more interest in the subject may require the author more fully to explain what he means by 'apostolical succession,' 'oblation of the Eucharist,' its 'virtue and efficacy,' the 'life-giving miracle,' &c. &c."

than that it must be believed, because it is ‘life-giving’<sup>1</sup>” To the first of these questions reply shall be made in the words of the Church Catechism. The miracle intended is this, “that the body and blood of CHRIST are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the LORD’s Supper.” And it is called “life-giving,” because it is the appointed means of participation of CHRIST, who is “a quickening Spirit,” and “our life;” even as He Himself said, “I am that bread of life,” and “he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life.” The objector goes on: “Does the miracle consist in the giving of life? Then is GOD robbed of His prerogative.” Did our SAVIOUR then forego His prerogative of opening the eyes of the blind, when He first “spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle,” and then “anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay?” It is asked again, “Is a miracle first wrought upon the elements, that they may give life? Then is the SPIRIT repelled from His own especial ordinance, and a symbol lifted up in the Church in the place of the Giver of Life.” In answer to this, it may perhaps be best to refer to the Primitive Liturgies<sup>2</sup>, and to that of our own Church as it was originally formed from them in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

The Primitive Liturgies, with the exception perhaps of the Roman, agree in distinctly invoking GOD the HOLY GHOST to descend upon the sacred elements, and prepare them to be the communication of CHRIST’s body and blood (and therefore of life supernatural) to the faithful. *E. g.* the Alexandrian Liturgy, denominated from St. Basil (the very

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Which, in those points wherein they agree, are equivalent to a genuine formulary of the first age. See Palmer’s *Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*, prefixed to his *Origines Liturgicæ*, and *Tracts for the Times*, No. 63.

words of which, in not a few cases, may be satisfactorily traced back at least to his own time), appoints this supplication to be used immediately after the commemoration of the words of institution<sup>1</sup>. “ We therefore, also, remembering His holy sufferings, His rising again from the dead, His ascension into heaven, His sitting on the right hand of Thee, who art GOD and FATHER, and His glorious and fearful coming again, offer unto Thee Thine own, out of Thine own gifts. And we supplicate and beseech Thee, merciful and gracious LORD,—we Thy sinful and unworthy servants,—and worship Thee, that by the good pleasure of Thy goodness, Thy HOLY SPIRIT may come upon us Thy servants, and upon these Thy gifts here set forth, and sanctify and exhibit them to be most holy: and may cause this bread to become the holy body of Him our LORD and GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, unto forgiveness of sins, and eternal life, to those who partake thereof: and this cup, the precious blood of the New Testament of Him our LORD and GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, unto forgiveness of sins and eternal life to all who partake thereof. And do Thou count us worthy, O LORD, to partake of Thy holy mysteries, unto sanctification of soul and body and spirit, that we may become one body and one spirit, and may find a portion and inheritance to possess with all Thy saints, who from all time have been well pleasing in Thy sight.” The first Prayer Book of King Edward VI. directed consecration to be made as follows: “ Heare us, O mercyfull FATHER, we beseeche Thee, and with Thy HOLY SPIRITE and worde vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the bodie and blood

<sup>1</sup> S. Basili Op. ed. Bened. t. iii. p. 678, 9.

of Thy most derely beloved Sonne JESUS CHRISTE; who in the same night," &c. (as in our present service). So far is the teaching of Tradition, on this point, from neglecting to honour the Giver of Life in the Sacrament of eternal life.

On the contrary, it may be thought, that if circumstances had permitted this part of the ancient service to be retained, communicants would have been so much the more effectually taught to give glory to the blessed SPIRIT, not only by the tenor of the Liturgy itself, but also by the light which it would have thrown on certain passages of holy writ, which, as things are, they hardly understand to refer to the Communion at all; such (*e. g.*) as where the Corinthians are reminded, "By one SPIRIT ye have been all baptised into one body, . . . and ye have been all made to drink into one SPIRIT<sup>1</sup>;" and where St. John mentions together as Three combining in One witness, the SPIRIT, and the Water, and the Blood: premising his remark with the following verse, which, to any one familiar with the ancient Liturgical services, must have sounded very descriptive of the Communion: "This is He that came" (or rather "cometh," ἐλθων) "by water

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 13. "i. e. We have arrived at the same mysterious privilege, we partake of the same table. And why said he not, We are fed with the same body, and drink the same blood? Because, by the word Spirit he indicated both—both the blood and the flesh—for by means of both we are made to drink of one SPIRIT. But, as I think, he is here speaking of *that visitation of the SPIRIT which takes place after Baptism and before the holy Communion*:" ἐκείνην τοῦ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ πρὸ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐγγινόμενην ἡμῖν." See St. Chrys. *in loco*. As much as to say that the Spirit here spoken of is the HOLY GHOST, shewing Himself especially in the two Sacraments; by His regenerating grace ensuing upon the Sacrament of Baptism, and by His consecrating grace preparing both the worshippers and the elements for the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

and blood, even JESUS CHRIST :” (for in those days they always mixed water in the cup of blessing ; and some, at least in St. Cyprian’s time, thought they might consecrate with water only<sup>1</sup> ; which error and irreverence, if it existed in St. John’s day also, might give occasion to the following clause) : “ Not by water only, but by water and blood. And,” he proceeds, “ it is the SPIRIT that beareth witness, because the SPIRIT is Truth,” or “ The Truth :” that which causes the reality and substance of the Sacraments, and hinders them from being mere signs and shadows. This conjectural interpretation is offered without any prejudice to the part which holy Baptism may be reasonably supposed to claim in the inspired allusion and argument, since there also is a combination of the visible water and the cleansing blood of CHRIST, and the HOLY SPIRIT is the agent, and has the glory<sup>2</sup>.

To return to our immediate subject ; it is painful to observe, in the course of this controversy, such a phrase as “ real inward communion with our LORD through His Apostles ;”—by which is meant participation of CHRIST by the mean which He Himself ordained, and which He committed to the keeping of His Apostles only ;—it is painful to observe this phrase caught up and used in a sarcastic sense : painful also to find that inability to

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 63. p. 148, &c. Ed. Fell.

<sup>2</sup> Another text, which is with great reason supposed to convey the same allusion, is Rom. xv. 15. “ The grace that is given me of God, that I should be the *Minister* (λειτουργὸν) of JESUS CHRIST unto the Gentiles, *exercising the priest’s office* (ἱερουργεῖν) in respect of the Gospel of GOD : that the *offering up* (προσφορὰ) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, BEING SANCTIFIED BY THE HOLY GHOST : (ἡγιασμένη ἐν ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ ἈΓΙΩ.)” In which passage are four or five liturgical words. This remark is borrowed from the papers of a deceased friend, which it is hoped will be given to the world before long. He seems to have taken it from a passage in Bp. Hic-  
 kes.

understand the precise nature of the privilege intended is considered as a sufficient bar to any devout practical remembrance of it.

One more quotation under this head shall be given without any remark : “ As to Mr. Keble’s notions of ‘the life-giving miracle’ of ‘CHRIST’s real Presence,’ which ‘has been left throughly mysterious both by Scripture and tradition,’ we shall only say that the records of Popery abundantly prove that mysticism is neither theology nor piety<sup>1</sup>. ”

5. The Apostolical Succession is another subject sure almost to attract to itself whatever particles of instinctive rationalism may be lurking in the mind to which it is presented. But surely in the outset it may claim to be treated with seriousness, on the ground urged by Bishop Butler against the despisers of religion in general ; viz., that the *a priori* objections which occur to ingenious men concerning it, are such as may be urged against God’s natural government, which is plain undeniable matter of fact in spite of all such objections ; therefore the apostolical succession *may*, as far as similar objections go, turn out matter of fact also, and the light extemporal way in which many reject it *may* have results similar to those, which attend the like rejection of other mysteries, whether of natural or of revealed religion. This consideration alone ought to protect the doctrine against insinuations, whether grave or sportive, that it is of course unworthy of God, because it represents Him as making the spiritual welfare of one man depend on the manner in which another executes his trust. Whatever is said against that dispensation would hold against what we daily see in the course of nature, as we call it. The

<sup>1</sup> *Christ. Obs.* May, 1837, p. 329.

moral condition of children is influenced by the conduct of their parents; of subjects by that of their rulers, and the like; and why should it not be equally credible, that even fallible and unworthy men may be endued with real power to put their brethren out of the Church, or admit them into it; *i. e.* to change their condition in such a manner as shall make the greatest possible difference in respect of revealed and covenanted privileges? (It is not said, "*immediately in respect of final salvation.*") Now this defensive argument from experience is so obvious in this case, and lies so near the root of all religion whatever, that it almost seems to be irreligious thoughtlessness, when men allow themselves to deride the Succession, either before all enquiry, or because on enquiry they find the evidence not so irresistible as they think it ought to be, or because the Succession itself is represented as a mystery, and of course left, as all mysteries are, in some respects dimly revealed; *i. e.* in the world's language, "vague and indistinct." That which was said to an impatient controversialist of old may be applied in this case, "Strike, but hear me;" do your best in argument if you can any how refute the claim of the Succession, but do not dismiss it, unexamined, in any kind of hasty feeling. Do not set it aside by saying, "Those who feel more interest in the subject may require its defenders more fully to explain what they mean by it;" or by treating it as "a new discovery in tradition,"—a vague idea of certain individuals only,—when all men know that it is a received theological term, denoting a doctrine clearly enough understood, and always maintained, whether truly or untruly, by more or fewer in this Church of England (to say nothing now of other times and churches) ever since the following statement was put forth by authority of Arch-

bishop Cramer: "Order is a gift of grace or ministration in CHRIST'S Church, given of GOD to Christian men by the consecration and imposition of the Bishop's hands upon them . . . and as the Apostles themselves, in the beginning of the Church, did order Priests and Bishops, so they appointed and willed the other Bishops after them to do the like<sup>1</sup>."

One would think the appearance, *prima facie*, of the doctrine in the Church Prayer Book might save it at least from being treated with contumely. This is a matter on which especial challenge has been made, and that challenge is accepted most willingly. On comparing different expressions of censure, it should seem that the phrase most objected to is "the grace of the apostolical succession." Two points are implied in the phrase; first, that the sacerdotal office in the Christian Church is conveyed by succession from the Apostles; secondly, that a peculiar grace or gift of the HOLY GHOST accompanies the conveyance of that office.

As to the first; if the Articles are to be taken in their literal and grammatical sense, surely the 23d Article affirms the principle of the succession, however confidently men quote it on the contrary side. The way to judge of this is to see how it would work in *practice*; for, as was remarked above, the Articles are altogether of a practical cast, adapted to the actual guidance of this Church and of her Ministers under controversies and cases really existing. Thus the Article in question supposes a person claiming to be a Christian Minister, and supplies a simple test whereby to determine whether such his claim be valid. It directs that this

<sup>1</sup> *Necessary Doctrine*, &c. 1543. ap. *Formularies of Faith temp. Hen. VIII.* Oxford. 1825, p. 277-8.

question be asked, "*Who called you to the office you assume?*" Was it one who had public authority given him to do so?" Now apply this to the first person professing to be ordained by Luther, or Calvin, or Wesley. Would he not, if he spake truth, be obliged to answer the second question in the negative? Must we not, by the letter of the Article, deny his commission? Suppose him nevertheless to go on, and pretend not only to preach, baptize, and consecrate, but also to ordain others, still pleading the same warrant, a commission to do so from Luther, or Calvin, or Wesley. Would not the same process have to be repeated, and with the same result, in the case of each person claiming to be ordained by him? unless we will say that though Luther or Calvin could not himself lawfully ordain, he might empower others to do so; which no one probably would ever think of maintaining. The Article therefore virtually enforces succession as the test of a lawful ministry. Were it strictly observed, no person, having only Lutheran, Calvinist, or Wesleyan orders, could ever be allowed to preach or minister the Sacraments in the congregation.

The title of Bishop indeed is not mentioned, and it may be that it was avoided on purpose to make the exclusion intended less invidious; but what if it turn out, as sometimes in Acts of Parliament, that the *description* answer the end of the enactment *more effectually* than the *name* would have done? Had it been simply said, "Those we judge lawfully called, who have their calling and mission from Bishops," there would have been perhaps room for the Genevan allegation, that all Presbyters, being in fact Bishops, received with their office the power of ordaining; but now the Article precludes this, by reciting (so to call it) the *special clause* in the episcopal commission, on which

the whole matter turns; as much as to say, "People may call themselves Bishops; but if they cannot shew that they have received this particular prerogative, we will not have their ordinations accounted lawful<sup>1</sup>." This meets the case of Danish ordinations at present; their superintendants are called Bishops, but there has been a break in the chain, and their ministers cannot make good the test required in the Article: consequently they cannot, according to our rule, be admitted to officiate in English churches. This is mentioned to show the *practical* bearing of the Article.

Observe now what would follow from this, if we could agree with those who consider the Articles as a Confession of Faith, supposing the term Confession of Faith to be taken in its usual and obvious meaning; viz. for a Creed, or enumeration of doctrinal fundamentals. Belief in the exclusion of all but episcopal orders, instead of being left indifferent, will be absolutely *made a condition of communion*; the very error which is falsely charged on the maintainers of apostolical succession; who believe it to be a divine and necessary ordinance, but are far from wishing it to be put in the Creed, or from requiring the express Knowledge and profession of it as a term of admission into the kingdom of Heaven.

But there is another place, where the English Church

<sup>1</sup> It may be worth remarking here that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth is the first which inserts in the Consecration Service an express mention of the power of Ordination as one of the especial prerogatives of Bishops, in the question, namely, "Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, and laying hands on others?" In all former ordinals, as Mr. Palmer shows, that power was understood of course as part of the episcopal office; no clause formally relating to it had been accounted necessary. The insertion afterwards may be thought to indicate an anxiety to point out the necessity of the test required in the Article.

defines who shall be taken for a lawful minister, viz. the Preface to the Ordination Service, and that in the following words: "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in the United Church of England and Ireland, . . . except he be called thereunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly EPISCOPAL consecration or ordination." Is it to be supposed that the Church, in different parts of her formularies, intended to give different accounts of the test of a lawful ministry? If not, then we have reason to believe that the Bishops, and the Bishops only, were in her mind, when she spoke in her twenty-third Article of a lawful calling being that which proceeds from "men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers in to the LORD's vineyard." The rather, as the thirty-sixth Article expressly adopts and approves the Ordination Services, affirming, on the one hand, against the Papists, that they "contain all things necessary to consecration and ordering;" on the other hand, against the Puritans, that "neither have they any thing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly." In which latter clause is implied an adoption of the other doctrine now excepted against—the doctrine of ministerial grace derived by succession from the Apostles; which doctrine, as will presently appear, runs through the Ordination Services.

But before proceeding to that head, let the reason be noticed, which the English Church herself assigns, for limiting her acknowledgment of a lawful call to those who have had episcopal consecration or ordination. It is "to the intent that these orders may be CONTINUED, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England." Without such limitation, it would seem, the Church judges

that the orders would not be "continued." This sounds a good deal like succession by episcopal ordination ; and the following words of the same preface carry back the succession to the Apostles : " It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that *from the Apostles' time* there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

We learn from this preface what to think of the occasional allowance of Presbyterian orders, which seems to have taken place during the first years of the Reformation, and which is supposed by some to receive sanction from a certain Act of the 13th of Elizabeth. It was neither more nor less than an illegal irregular proceeding, connived at sometimes for supposed edification's sake, sometimes for political reasons ; but from time to time excepted against, as in the case of Whittingham, by Archbishop Sandys ; in that of Travers, by Archbishop Whitgift ; and never, as it may seem, effectually vindicated. And as both the above-mentioned cases occurred after the Act of the 13th of Elizabeth, one might with some likelihood infer, that it was the intention of that Act to take away doubt touching the admissibility of Romish rather than of Genevan letters of orders. Clearly it was so understood and acted on ; as is shewn by the complaints of Travers in his own behalf, and of Lord Huntingdon in behalf of Whittingham<sup>1</sup>. Anyhow, the Act, resting only on secular authority, cannot have done away with the ordination service, which is still received by solemn subscription of the whole clergy of England. And if the meaning of it was such as is pretended, it is but one more instance of the danger of

<sup>1</sup> Travers ap. Hooker, iii. 690 ; Strype, *Ann.* II. 2. p. 168, 620.

allowing mere statesmen to legislate for the Church. In the mean time, nothing which then took place can in any way affect our present succession ; it not being averred by any one that ever the office of Bishop was allowed to be exercised on such ordination. Nor, as long as the Ordination Services, with their preface, shall remain as they are, can the Church of England be fairly made responsible for any irregularity of the kind, any more than for the late suppression of bishopricks, by a Parliament in which Dissenters held sway. She may suffer intrusion, but her witness to the truth remains.

We have next to examine, whether the Church formularies seem to encourage the idea, that the episcopal succession is a channel of any special grace. We need not be long to seek : the cavils of the Church's enemies will presently direct us to the right point. "The HOLY GHOST," said Cartwright and Travers, "you cannot give, and therefore you foolishly bid men receive it<sup>1</sup>." What was the reply of the Church's defender ? Did he disavow all mystical import in the sacred words "Receive the HOLY GHOST," as employed in the ordination services ? Did he explain them away, as carrying with them no more than the virtue of a prayer, on behalf of the newly ordained, that they might be faithful, and their ministry blessed<sup>2</sup> ? Nay, the language, of which he was so unrivalled a master, fails him, as it were, in his endeavour to find words to express the greatness of the gift which he there apprehended. "The HOLY GHOST," says he<sup>3</sup>, "which our LORD then gave," (when he spake the words to his Apostles,) "was a holy and a ghostly authority, authority over

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, V. lxxvii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet on *Art.* 36.

<sup>3</sup> Hooker, V. lxxvii. 7, 8.

the souls of men, authority, a part whereof consisteth in power to remit and retain sins: 'Receive the HOLY GHOST; whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted; whose sins ye retain, they are retained.' . . . Seeing therefore that *the same power is now given*, why should the same form of words expressing it be thought foolish? . . . The power and authority delivered with those words is itself *χαρίσμα*, a gracious donation which the SPIRIT of GOD doth bestow." And besides, "we may most assuredly persuade ourselves that the hand which imposeth upon us the function of our ministry, doth, under the same form of words, so tie itself thereunto, that he which receiveth the burthen is thereby for ever warranted to have the SPIRIT with him and in him for his assistance, countenance, and support, in whatsoever he faithfully doth to discharge duty. . . . When we take ordination, we also receive the presence of the HOLY GHOST, partly to guide, direct, and strengthen us in all our ways, and partly to assume unto itself, for the more authority, those actions that appertain to our place and calling. . . . We have for the least and lowest duties performed by virtue of ministerial power, *that* to dignify, grace, and authorize them, which no other offices on earth can challenge. Whether we preach, pray, baptize, communicate, condemn, give absolution, or whatever, as disposers of God's mysteries; our words, judgments, acts, and deeds, are not ours, but the HOLY GHOST's." Before, in a still more striking passage<sup>1</sup>, he had borne testimony not only to the reality of the grace then and there given, but also to the ordinary necessity of being able to show our LORD's warrant for conferring it; i. e., in other words, to the apostolical succession. "The power of the ministry of

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxvii. 1.

GOD translateth out of darkness into glory ; it raiseth men from the earth, and bringeth GOD himself down from heaven ; by blessing visible elements, it maketh them invisible grace ; it giveth daily the HOLY GHOST ; it hath to dispose of that Flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that Blood which was poured out to redeem souls ; when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked they perish ; when it revoketh the same they revive. O wretched blindness, if we admire not so great power, more wretched if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding imagine that any but GOD can bestow it !”

Hooker then made no question as to the mystical import and virtue of the form, wherewith the Church of England ordains and consecrates. And his construction seems to be greatly confirmed by the choice of lessons which she has made for those occasions, by the scriptural allusions of which the offices are full, and by the use of the solemn prayer, *Veni Creator*, immediately before the laying on of hands.

In these short and occasional remarks, it was not possible to do justice to so high an argument : but the Author hopes that enough has been said, to show that there are appearances of both the succession and the grace conveyed by it being recognized, as well in the Articles as in the Ordination Service. There is so much in favour of them, as ought to protect the whole subject from scornful indifference and dismissal without examination <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> These words perhaps may be taken, as similar words in the Sermon have been, (see *Observations*, &c., p. 81,) for indications of the author's opinion as to the prevailing tone of thought among the clergy on subjects of this kind. He can only say that he was far from any such sentiment : his censures, where he does censure, are directed against the spirit of the age, not against the clerical body ; among whom he thankfully and hopefully

Nor let any person shrink from this view, under the notion that it invests the ministry with any thing like infallible authority. We may not be able to conceive how, yet undoubtedly so it is, that a man may receive the grace of GOD in vain; he may defile the temple of the HOLY GHOST; he may have supernatural grace dwelling in him, to guide him into all goodness, and yet may be "almost in all evil:" why then should it be incredible that a minister of GOD, as such, may have the same SPIRIT specially abiding in *him*, as for all other parts of his office, so for the custody of the good deposit, the fundamentals of doctrine and practice, and yet be liable to error, and heresy, and apostasy? That grace implies infallibility, is an error of the same school, which supposes that faith cannot be required except on overpowering, demonstrative evidence; which is impatient of obscurity and indistinctness, and longs after present visible *effect*; which fancies, in the pregnant words of a great writer<sup>1</sup>, "that it cannot be thought GOD would have bestowed any favour at all upon us, unless in the degree which we think He might;" and where there is instruction, and spiritual aid, and a chance of salvation, concludes that there must of necessity be also comfort, and assurance, and satisfaction of mind.

6. Once more. There appears to be danger of irreverence—danger of a very subtle and insidious kind—in declining *religiously* to accept universal tradition (con-

acknowledges, that a far better spirit prevails, and is likely to prevail. Further, the phrases objected to, in many cases, do not imply censure at all. They are forms of expression which naturally occur where one is arguing, on the method of Bp. Butler, not that a thing is actually true, but that it is worth considering, and, till disproved, ought to be acted on: which is all that the Sermon pretends to.

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Butler, *Anal.* p. II. c. vi. near the beginning.

firmed as it is by Scripture) as our guide in the *selection of fundamentals*: if at least it be irreverence, rather to choose for ourselves among Scripture truths, which we will regard as fundamental, and which secondary, than to acquiesce in the choice made for us with such evidence of providential guidance, as reasonable persons would consider sufficient in all other practical matters.

The word Irreverence, let it be observed, is used here to denote the *tendency* of the principle, not the *actual feeling* of any particular person. No doubt, among those who have been trained in the notion here combated, are many of most reverential hearts and lives; and one sign of their being so is, that they do almost always, more or less unconsciously perhaps, yet really, use the Creed of their Baptism, the baptismal Creed of the holy Church Universal, to help them in making their selection, and to test it when made<sup>1</sup>.

But the farther we are from questioning any individual's devotion and reverence, the more necessary does it seem to be on our guard against the principle, if erroneous: since its acceptance by such persons is an alarming symptom of its very general influence. The principle meant is that which would make it necessary for each person to select for himself a certain number of divine truths out of the great body of the Scriptures, on which he may lay his finger and say; "*This, and this alone, is the Gospel: it hangs together as one perfect whole?*" Surely this is a startling kind of proposition, to be enunciated by any individual as the result of his own inquiries. Surely it is not a prerogative to be

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mr. Butt's *Observations*, &c., p. 5—13, with p. 24, 25, especially line 3—8, of p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Observations*, p. 10.

lightly assumed, that of sitting in judgment on Scripture truths, and determining which are essential as formal objects of belief, and which not. Surely it involves a responsibility far more perilous, and a labour far more overwhelming, than the method which the Sermon recommends; accepting, namely, as the Gospel, the substance of the baptismal Creed; testing it by Scripture; and, when it has been scripturally verified, acquiescing in the judgment of the Church—the Primitive Universal Church—concerning its sufficiency.

Observe, what is insisted on is the *substance*, not the identical expressions of the Creed<sup>1</sup>: according to the general if not universal difference between the traditional and written relics of the Apostles; that in the former, the *things* only,—in the latter, the very *words* also,—are holy. This may suffice to answer historical objections, drawn from the variation in terms between reports made of the baptismal Creed by Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenæus, and others; to which, if one added the partial enumeration by St. Paul in the beginning of 1 Cor. xv., a good deal might be said for the probability of such a conjecture.

But are there not other objections felt, besides historical ones, to the paramount authority of the Creed? The expression, “It hangs together as one perfect whole,” would seem to imply a disposition to require, as essential to any statement of fundamentals, that its parts should be connected with one another *in a manner intelligible to us*; whereas the propositions of the Creed are isolated in form, and do not at all impress the mind with any necessity of apprehending them as portions of an entire system. For any thing that appears on the face of the document, it may be sufficient heartily to receive, and practically to

<sup>1</sup> See *Observations*, &c., p. 29.

acknowledge, each truth as it there stands, whether we discern much or little of their relation to each other. Here then is a remarkable difference between the traditional statement of fundamentals, and those which devout and ingenious men are in the habit of selecting and arranging for themselves. System, method, connection, mutual illustration, is a *sine qua non* in the one; not so in the other. What authority have we for so insisting on it? Scripture says, such and such things are necessary: does it any where say, we must be able to show why they are necessary? Is not the rule applicable in respect of our faith towards God, which holds in all other parts of our moral conduct? "The *fact* is the main point or principle; and, if in such matters *that* be made sufficiently evident, there will be no need to give the *reason* besides<sup>1</sup>." We have here, then, a *second* instance of unconscious irreverence, into which those who refuse Primitive Tradition as their guide to the selection of fundamentals are almost inevitably betrayed. Professing and intending to confine themselves to the written Word of God, they do in effect bring in a mere human unauthorized tradition; viz. that in order to a right faith in the Gospel, the connection of its parts as a system must be discerned<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ἀρχὴ τὸ ὅτι· καὶ εἰ ἐν τοῦτοις φαίνονται ἀρκούντως, οὐδὲν προσδέησει τοῦ εἰότι.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to have been a fallacy of this kind which led to the censure uttered in the course of this controversy (Mr. Russell's *Remarks*, p. 21, 37, &c.), on the assertion that the Atonement was not a *manifestation of God's justice*: by which is probably meant, that *we have no sufficient data to prove it exactly just*, according to our notion of justice. No one denies that it is an awful signification of God's justice, so far as it is fitted and intended to impress our minds with a deep sense of His real hatred of sin. Of course, if faith implies full and systematic understanding, to say that you cannot explain our Lord's satisfaction is equivalent to saying you do not believe it. Not so, on any other supposition. But "the *deductions* of supernatural truth

From which immediately follows a *third* great evil: that when, after our best efforts, we are not able to make out the place of any particular doctrine in the system, we are tempted to leave it out of our Creed, as unessential, at any rate to us. The common pervading attractive force, by the supposed laws of which it has become usual in our days to adjust the relation of the parts of Christianity with each other, is their tendency to act on the soul of man, and produce in him such and such heavenly dispositions. Those doctrines, in which it is less easy to discern any such practical tendency, are of course comparatively disregarded. May it be permitted to exemplify what is meant, by a passage, which however it is not intended to charge with any kind of presumption or irreverence, but only so far as such qualities may appear to be inseparable from the theory in question<sup>1</sup>?

“No truths, whether positively declared in Scripture, or inferred from it by legitimate reasoning, or founded on the tradition and usage of the Church, or deduced from the light of Nature, are to be placed on a level with the Gospel, considered as a transaction between God and the soul of man; and in this character I am anxious to pourtray it. This is an exclusive, unmingled treasure, which I would hedge in, as it were, with an impassable circle. It is the second covenant—the covenant of grace. I would lay it up are not within the sphere of the human intellect. They are not to be inferred as discoverable conclusions from one primary principle. A Redeemer being foretold, His divine nature, His incarnation, the vicarious nature of His suffering, His death, and the atoning efficacy of it;—all these, though real connections of truth, comprehended, with the original promise, in the scheme of the Divine economy, come down to man like new streams of light by their separate channels; and when they are communicated in their proper form, then we know them, not before.” Davison, *on Primitive Sacrifice*, p. 152.

<sup>1</sup> *Observations*, p. 12, 13.

before the LORD in his most holy place within the ark, and under the overshadowing mercy-seat. Every Christian is now consecrated to enter with boldness within the veil, and plead there the merit of the blood of JESUS, and to claim a share in the privileges which this sacrifice has sealed to him. And provided such unapproachable pre-eminence is awarded to the truths which relate to high and solemn communication between the pardoned sinner and his GOD, while no comparative stranger is allowed to intermeddle with these, I am desirous of yielding to all other truths the reverence or obedience which on full consideration appears to be due to each of them respectively. Without much caution they ought not even to be arranged in classes."

The remark in the last sentence would seem to be a wholesome check on the preceding, were it not for the reason added: namely, that "*even scriptural verities are separated from each other by a great interval of relative importance.*" They must be arranged, then, as far as possible, *one by one*, according to their more or less visible connection with that scheme of scriptural truths, which each person has made out to be his own gospel. Can this be proved by reason or Scripture? Is it not a mere human tradition, contrary to the analogy of GOD's natural and moral government, and traceable to a known infirmity of fallen mankind?

But to proceed: the secret but sure *tendency* of measuring the vitality of any truth, by the clearness with which we discern its connection with "the Gospel, considered as a transaction between GOD and the soul of man," is to withdraw attention, and finally faith, from the unseen truths themselves, towards the process in our own minds, which is matter of feeling and experience: *e. g.* from the catholic verities concerning the most holy TRINITY, to *our*

own contemplation of GOD *simply* as our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. It is enough just to mention this topic, which has received of late both full discussion in the writings of the defenders of Primitive Tradition, and melancholy illustration in the conduct of some of its most strenuous opponents. And may it not be taken as an indication of the *tendency* of the theory, that the list of fundamentals, offered in exemplification of it', includes no express

1 *Observations, &c.* (7—9.) "The fall of man,—the depravity of his heart and life,—his utter helplessness and consequent misery,—the love of GOD to his ungrateful creature,—the covenant of mercy which drew down the only begotten SON of the FATHER to assume our sinful nature, and to make full atonement on the Cross for offences beyond human calculation both in number and criminality,—the acceptance of this ransom by the offended Truth and Justice of the Most Holy GOD, and our free and entire discharge from the condemnation wherein the whole race of Adam is involved;—these indeed are *faithful sayings*, intimately and inseparably bound together, and can never be forgotten by him who has eagerly received them as an authoritative expansion of the *saying which is worthy of all men to be received, that CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners*. Such then is the Gospel, if we take a retrospective view from the comprehensive vantage ground of CHRIST's resurrection.

"And again, regard the glorious consequences of that event. The gift of the holy and sanctifying SPIRIT was purchased by this inestimable price. He was given without measure to the SON, who bountifully bestows this rich portion on His redeemed brethren. The HOLY GHOST descends to make the message of salvation available to us, by changing our hearts and rendering us meet for the kingdom of heaven. Through Him we are united in communion with the FATHER and the SON; for His purifying and converting grace we are taught to pray, and in answer to our prayers He does form in all hearts which open to His influence the blessed tempers and dispositions particularised by our LORD, at the very outset of His ministry, in the Beatitudes. . . . The belief in the personality of this Almighty Agent, and in the reality of His regenerating work, which engrafs these blessed dispositions in the renewed soul, was established on an immovable basis in the primitive Church by His miraculous operations. Through the same SPIRIT Christian hope appropriates to itself all the inestimable treasures of the Gospel. He unites the elect people of GOD in one holy Church, to which the promises are made sure by an immutable oath: the resurrection

affirmation of the doctrine just mentioned? Is it not a list which might be accepted, as far as the letter of it goes, by an Arian or Sabellian? And this consideration is more serious, the more entirely we are convinced of the orthodoxy and judgment of the person drawing up such a confession. So much the stronger does the argument become for superseding all private opinions, even the best qualified, in the selection of fundamentals; and for acquiescing rather in the baptismal Creed, according to that interpretation of it which the Nicene Creed proves *by moral demonstration* to have been the interpretation of the apostolical times. "Of the apostolical times;" for to those in effect we appeal, when we appeal to the Nicene Fathers. We call them in as evidence, not as judges. But of this subject more will be said by and by.

In the meantime it may be well to notice one more symptom of the unconscious rationalism, in which men are involved by mistrust of primitive tradition. They dwell on single texts or propositions, enouncing some one great gospel truth, (*e. g.* the resurrection of our LORD,) as if acknowledging them were equivalent to an acknowledg-

of CHRIST our head is in certainty of consequence the resurrection of us also, His happy and privileged members. He will return from His mediatorial throne, where He is now subduing all enemies, and ordering all things for our benefit, that He may take us to Himself. But all the descendants of Adam, without exception, shall be assembled before His awful tribunal: then shall the unbelieving and impenitent be cast, body and soul, into unquenchable fire; the inscrutable mystery of GOD shall then be finished; His perfect attributes shall then be manifested and vindicated; thenceforth saints and angels shall be for ever united in one glorious family; they shall be one with their GOD and SAVIOUR and SANCTIFIER, and with each other through endless ages.

"*This, and this alone, is the Gospel; it hangs together as one perfect whole. No man can be rightly instructed in one part, who has radically erroneous views of any portion of it.*"

ment of the whole Gospel<sup>1</sup>. And so, virtually and in reason, it is, but not practically, not in the faith of men's minds. All geometrical truths may be involved in the original axioms and definitions, but we do not therefore consider a person who has learned the two or three first pages of Euclid as actually assenting to all that is important in geometry. Now we see what fatal use will be made of this particular method of simplifying beyond what the Church has sanctioned, by the history of the school of Episcopius, Locke, and Hoadly: they set out with this aphorism, "that the one point of faith necessary to salvation was simply to believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the true Messiah." What was the result? The first discarded the divinity of our LORD from his list of fundamental truths; the second, apparently, was at least an Arian<sup>2</sup>; the third denied the grace of the Sacraments. True therefore as it may be in a certain sense to say, that any one book or any one text of Scripture contains in itself, after a sort, all things necessary to eternal salvation, it is not a truth which in any way dispenses with the use of Creeds and confessions of faith; or of Tradition, if any can be produced capable of guaranteeing such documents. It is not a truth which can help us to discern fundamentals. For the question will still remain, "which among the many things implied in this comprehensive saying are needful to be really thought of and professed by all?" and the deeper and more comprehensive the proposition may be, the more is this difficulty enhanced. The appropriate use of such texts lies, not in the *selection* of fundamentals, but in their

<sup>1</sup> *Observations*, &c. p. 5, 11.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, Works, vii. 171. ed. 1801. *Commentary on the Epistles*, viii. 122, 338.

*demonstration.* "Tradition," in this respect, "teaches : Scripture proves." And we ought to be very thankful to the Almighty for leaving us a tradition so complete as the Creed is, not only for our comfort, but because we are thereby spared a great and otherwise inevitable temptation to a kind of irreverence, which, as it is, proves but too inviting to many of us : the irreverence of dealing rudely with the words of the Most High, while we are handling them as the materials of a system which we are to plan out for ourselves, instead of marking them with silent reverence, as the foundations of a vast Temple, the outline whereof, so far as we can trace it, has been previously delivered into our hands by an unerring Architect.

The reader has now before him a specimen, both of the kind of *protest* which seemed desirable, on behalf of the great church principles, against the misrepresentations which commonly beset them ; and also of the *cautions* most required in the examination of those principles. And if, under the latter head, for clearness' sake, and also for the sake of incidentally justifying what he had before stated, the author has illustrated his argument from the pages of those writers to whom he is unfortunately opposed in this discussion, it has not been, if he at all knows himself, from any unkind or invidious feeling, but simply because he knew no better way of pointing out the tendency of their line of argument, towards a rationalism not the less perilous to others, because they themselves are utterly unconscious of it. He charges no man with disloyalty to the Church of England, and hopes in his turn not to be so charged ; convinced as he is, that the view which he humbly advocates is not only permitted, but warranted and taught, by her formularies. And, in the substantial truth of that view, for which, every day of his life, he

seems to perceive accumulating evidence, from Scripture, from Reason, and from Church History, he finds a sure ground of hope, that the earnest and (he trusts) not uncharitable, inculcation of it will not be hurtful to the Church of God.

Although in general the author has declined noticing, in this Postscript, objections of detail, criticisms on particular expressions, or fallacies apprehended in particular arguments; as feeling that if persons could be once set in the right way with regard to the great principles, such things might well be passed over, affecting, at most, what is of small consequence in comparison, his own credit for skill in reasoning, history, or languages; yet there are two points, on which it may be well to make an exception to that rule, by reason of their aptness to illustrate the whole subject.

One of these topics is, the state of the Canon of the New Testament implied in St. Paul's Epistles, particularly those to Timothy. The Sermon had said, "The truths and rules, committed by St. Paul to Timothy's charge, were wholly or for the most part unwritten." The expression was so far, perhaps, verbally incorrect, as it took no notice of the Old Testament, which undoubtedly formed part of the Church's *Depositum*, quite down from the day of Pentecost. But it is objected to on a different ground: viz. that at the time when these Epistles were indited, a very large proportion of the books of the New Testament was already in existence<sup>1</sup>. The objection overlooks the fact, that the time spoken of was not the time when St. Paul was writ-

<sup>1</sup> *Gen. of Examination*, p. 23

ing, but when Timothy received his charge, *i. e.* when he was first admitted to a portion in the Christian ministry. And that was, before St. Paul wrote the first Epistle to the Thessalonians; as is probable, by the opening of that epistle, where Timothy joins with St. Paul and Silas in a solemn benediction to the Church; and evident, from the following passage: “We sent Timotheus, our brother, and a *minister of God*, and a *fellow-worker with us* in the Gospel of CHRIST<sup>1</sup>.” Now the date of that epistle lies between A.D. 51 and A.D. 53. And Mr. Greswell, with great probability, assigns to the year 52, or thereabouts, the first appearance both of St. Mark’s Gospel, and of the Greek of that of St. Matthew. In short, with the exception of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew, the first epistle to the Thessalonians seems to be generally considered by learned men as the earliest portion of the whole Christian Scriptures. That the Thessalonians, at least, had no other part of the New Testament as yet in their hands, may not improbably be argued, perhaps, from a verse in the second epistle, “Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have received, whether by word or our epistle.” This does not seem a natural way of writing, if they possessed any Gospel or Epistle besides, of equal authority with the letter which St. Paul had sent. Yet if St. Paul or Timothy knew of any such, we should naturally expect them to have communicated it to the Thessalonians; who seem to have been as worthy of such a boon as any converts could be, by their simple and affectionate faith; and whose condition as new converts, early bereft of their spiritual fathers, and exposed to much persecution and insult, called for all the comfort and

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 2.

aid which such memorials were apt to afford. Again, if St. Paul knew not as yet either St. Matthew's Gospel, or St. Mark's, (for to them the question is nearly confined), it is hardly conceivable that either could have been made public over any considerable part of the existing Church. For to whom could such a document have been known sooner than to the learned and vigilant Apostle of the Gentiles? It follows that both the charge delivered to Timothy, and the faith in which the Thessalonians were instructed, were "almost or wholly unwritten," excepting always so much as was contained in the books of the Old Testament. Those books, indeed, Timothy had known "from a child," and they were "able to make him wise unto salvation:" but then it was "through faith that was in CHRIST JESUS:" *i. e.* by the help of that key to their true meaning, which the history and doctrine of CHRIST, written or unwritten, afforded to considerate believers.

The argument therefore is in a great measure independent of the exact number of books supposed to be written before such and such an epistle. It is sufficient on the question of date that the gospel of St. John, allowed to be doctrinally one of the most important portions of the Bible, was later than all St. Paul's writings: and that St. Paul, in writings of several dates, speaks of the *παράκατα-θηκὴ*, or *depositum*, as of a standard or measure complete in itself, and completely within reach of those whom he was addressing. The gradual accumulation of the treasures of the New Testament was going on all the while, but, as a standard of doctrine, was rather a provision for future ages, than a necessary supply of any want then existing. The case has been compared, not unaptly, to that ingenious contrivance of modern machinery, by which two metals, expanding under opposite temperatures, are

arranged so as that the shrinking of the one shall be compensated by the dilating of the other, whereby on the whole the same effect is produced. Thus when exact tradition, of all at least but fundamental doctrine <sup>1</sup>, would have become gradually more uncertain, its place was providentially supplied by the Canon of Scripture becoming fixed, and thoroughly known all over the Christian world. An effect mainly perhaps attributable (among second causes) to the operation of the great Church principle, that necessary doctrines must all be proveable from Scripture. Bishop Taylor gives a remarkable instance of the process here alluded to. It is quoted here, not as altogether accurate, but as throwing light both on the general argument, and on that great writer's opinion. "Because the books of Scripture were not all written at once, nor at once communicated, nor at once received; therefore the Churches of God at first were forced to trust their memories, and to try the doctrines by appealing to the memories of others; *i. e.* to the consenting report, and faith delivered and preached to other Churches, especially the chiefest, where the memory of the Apostles was recent and permanent. The mysteriousness of CHRIST's priesthood, the perfection of his sacrifice, and the unity of it, CHRIST's advocacy and intercession for us in heaven, might very well be accounted traditions, before St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was admitted for canonical; but now they are written truths, and if they had not been written, it is likely we should have lost them. But this way could not long be necessary, and could not long be safe <sup>2</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Fundamentals were secured, *perhaps*, by the Creed: *i. e.* in substance, though not in *essence*.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, vol. x. p. 425.

Nay, and we have higher testimony yet to appeal to. St. Luke wrote his Gospel to Theophilus expressly for this end, that it might be a "document of proof;" not to supersede the catechetical instructions (*i. e.* in other words, the traditions) of the Church, but to make us all (*ἐπιγινῶναι*) know more firmly than ever, *τὴν ἀσφαλείαν*, the absolute certainty of those elementary truths, wherein we, in common with Theophilus, have been instructed, and which we, by the Gospel history, may clearly discern to have come down from heaven. In all this there is nothing to contradict, but much surely to favour, the notion that Christians never were designed to be left to collect each his own Gospel out of the Scriptures by the unbiassed exercise of private judgment<sup>1</sup>. And so far as it can be shown by any thing like decisive evidence, that we have in our Creeds substantially the same catechetical truths which Theophilus had been taught, so far we are the very persons for whose immediate use St. Luke wrote, and must of course come to the reading of his Gospel with a great advantage over those who consider themselves bound not only to *confirm* but to *discover*.

But here comes in the second question of detail, on which it seemed desirable to touch; the question, in what sense, and in what measure, the Nicene Creed was traditional rather than scriptural.

Now the method of proceeding at Nicæa appears to have been nearly as follows: Each Bishop was required to rehearse the faith which he and his church professed, and into which they were baptized. In those statements when nothing appeared of the peculiar views of Arius, but all, on the contrary, with seventeen or eighteen exceptions,

<sup>1</sup> Compare on St. Luke's Preface, Dr. Hawkins on *Unauthoritative Tradition*, p. 35, 36.

agreed substantially in the orthodox interpretation, and shrank, with religious horror, from the first sound of the new doctrine ; the burthen of proof was of course thrown on the heresiarch, and he was required to make good his theory by allegations from Scripture ; which he endeavoured to do, availing himself also to the utmost of his own skill in philosophy and dialectics. But his allegations being overthrown by large arguments from Scripture itself, the orthodox creed was considered as sufficiently established. However, to seal the doctrine for ever against the like or more plausible misconstruction, the orthodox traditional interpretation was incorporated into a written creed : being first thoroughly vindicated, both in the substance and wording of it, and also in the annexed anathema<sup>1</sup>, by reasoning out of Holy Writ. The result was, the Nicene Creed with its anathema. In that document, therefore, we have two points clearly made out ; first, the substance of the baptismal Creed of those times ; and secondly, the tradition then received on the sense and importance of the disputed article. These two complete the Creed as a formula ; and therefore, *as a formula*, it may be truly said to have its origin, not from Scripture but from tradition : and yet it is quite necessary that every word of it should be proveable from Holy Scripture, and quite certain that all was so proved, with most religious care, in the first instance.

<sup>1</sup> The anathema originally annexed to the Nicene Creed, and answering in its ecclesiastical use to the severe monitory clauses of the Athanasian Creed in the Church of England, is as follows :—"Those who say, ' There was a time when He was not,' and, ' Before He was begotten He was not,' and, ' He came into being from among things non-existent, or of some other substance or being,'—those who affirm that the Son of God is ' created,' or ' mutable,' or ' alterable,'—are hereby anathematized by the Holy Catholic and Apostolical Church." See Theodoret *E. H.* i. 12 ; St. Athanas. *ad Jovian.* t. i. 781 ; Concil. Harduin. i. 444 ; Socr. i. 8. p. 23.

As to the fact that such were the proceedings of the council, it may not, perhaps, be set down in so many words by any historian; but it is capable of being established by circumstantial evidence of the strongest kind. First, there is the general presumption in favour of it. What would all men—what should we ourselves—do under the like circumstances? Would it be natural to discard all reference to Creeds, and Catechisms, and Articles, and Liturgies, out of “an earnest desire to draw all things unto the determination of bare and naked Scripture<sup>1</sup>?” To come with minds altogether blank to the study of the Bible, as to the cultivation of a field which no one had ever yet laboured in? For example, suppose a convocation now called to settle this very point, what degree of deference is due to primitive tradition; would the received formularies of the Church of England be left entirely out of the question? Nay, already, in the present controversy, a certain tradition—*i. e.* the Thirty-nine Articles—has been alleged<sup>2</sup> as a decisive touchstone of the truth as well as importance of whatever may be taught by a member of the English Church. Whether the allegation in the particular instance were altogether just and adequate, or no, still it seems to indicate, that even the opponents of tradition, had they been present at Nicea, might have been led to make considerable use of it.

But let us see what the history of the council contains, to confirm or disappoint this our natural expectation. Is there any thing in the line taken by those most influential in the council, before the proceedings commenced, which may help us in judging of the course they would be most likely to pursue afterwards? The public document, by

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, *E. P.* ii. 7. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Brief Examination*, p. 57.

which the peril arising from Arianism was first made known to the Church generally, was the circular letter of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, signed also by his clergy, to the Bishops of every diocese<sup>1</sup>. Now in that letter the line taken is analogous to what is here supposed. First he states against Arius, according to Tertullian's rule in such cases, the *præscriptio*, or preliminary exception, arising from the novelty of his doctrines. "Who," says he, "ever heard such things<sup>2</sup>? or who now hearing them is not astonished, and stoppeth his ears, that the contamination of these words may not touch his hearing?" These are not mere rhetorical exclamations; as is proved by a comparison with a passage of Athanasius, which begins with the same saying: a saying which indeed appears to have grown into a watchword among the Catholics. "*Who ever heard of such things*<sup>3</sup>? Whence or from whom did the parasites or bribed partisans of the heresy hear such things? Who, when they were catechumens, spake such things to them? Who told them, 'Leave your worship of the creature, and draw near again to worship a being created and made.' Now if they themselves confess that they have now for the first time heard such things, let them not deny that this heresy is a stranger and not of the Fathers. But that which is not of the Fathers, but just now invented, what other character can it have than such as St. Paul foretold: 'In the latter times some shall depart from the sound faith?'" Alexander's view may be further understood by his letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, of the same name, in which the order of the topics is indeed inverted, but the substance of the reasoning is exactly the same<sup>4</sup>. The occasion of the letter being to announce the

<sup>1</sup> St. Athanas. i. 397.<sup>2</sup> τίς γάρ ἤκουσε πώποτε τοιαῦτα;<sup>3</sup> St. Athanas. i. 412. C; cf. 902. B.<sup>4</sup> Ap. Theodoret E. H. i. 3.

excommunication of Arius, he was led first to give some account of the Arian errors, on which naturally followed a refutation of them out of Scripture: but that being ended, the holy Bishop was not willing to conclude without a distinct enunciation of his own and his church's faith, conceived in such terms, and with such arrangement, as evidently show it to be a paraphrase on the baptismal or apostolical Creed then in use at Alexandria. "Concerning which things we so believe, as seemeth meet to the apostolical Church: In one unbegotten FATHER . . . . and in one Lord JESUS CHRIST, the only-begotten SON of GOD . . . . and besides this religious opinion concerning the FATHER and SON, as the sacred Scriptures teach, we confess one HOLY GHOST . . . . one only Catholic Church, the apostolical one, . . . . and after this we acknowledge the resurrection from the dead, the first fruits whereof was our Lord JESUS CHRIST, who assumed the body really, and not in appearance only, of Mary the mother of GOD: who, in the end of the world, to put away sin, sojourned among the race of mankind; who was crucified and died, and rose again from the dead, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of Majesty . . . . These things we teach, these we preach, these are the apostolical doctrines of the Church, for the sake of which also we die, not regarding those who would force us to disavow them, even though they compel us by torments; not drawing back from the hope which is in them."

Thus much may suffice to show the opinion of the venerable Alexander concerning the best way of dealing with the controversy which led to the Nicene Council. But there is another person, St. Athanasius, whose judgment on the same point would go near to determine the question: it being well known that for all the inferiority

of his rank (for he was then only a deacon in the Alexandrian Church) he exercised a principal influence on the tone and course of the deliberations at Nicæa. Now St. Athanasius more than once mentions a certain "form or stamp" <sup>1</sup> of the faith of a Christian, *χαρακτῆρα τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ*, by recurrence to which doctrines may be best tried, and heresy repressed; and this form or stamp, he says, we receive by tradition, but are able to demonstrate it by the Scriptures <sup>2</sup>. Thus, speaking of the Arian misinterpretation of the text in Proverbs, rendered by the LXX., "The LORD created me to be the chief of His ways," he remarks as follows <sup>3</sup>: "The heretic will say, Is it not so written? It is so written, and so expressed with the highest reason; but that which is well said, the heretics understand ill. For if they had perceived and known the very Form (*χαρακτῆρα*) of Christianity, they would not have said that the LORD of glory is a creature, nor have stumbled at the good words of Scripture. But they do not know, nor understand; therefore, as it is written, they walk in darkness. Nevertheless, it is right for us to explain this point, that their folly may be made manifest in this respect also, and that we may not leave out that which is the proper test to be employed against their impiety; perhaps too that themselves may come to a better mind. The very form then of the faith in CHRIST is this <sup>4</sup>: That

<sup>1</sup> *Χαρακτῆρ* properly means the image impressed by a seal; and is transferred to any thing which is originated by and accurately represents another thing. Cf. Heb. i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. ad Adelph. t. i. 914. E. Ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ πίστις ἐστὶν ὀρθή, καὶ ἐκ διδασκαλίας ἀποστολικῆς ὁρμωμένη καὶ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων, βεβαιουμένη ἐκ τε νέας καὶ παλαιᾶς ᾠθόλης.

<sup>3</sup> i. 688. B.

<sup>4</sup> Ὁ χαρακτῆρ τοίνυν τῆς ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤΩ πιστεως ἐστὶν οὗτος· τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ΘΕΟΥ, κ. τ. λ.

the SON, the WORD of GOD, being GOD, (for ‘in the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was GOD,’) being the Wisdom and Power of the FATHER, (for ‘CHRIST is the Power of GOD and the Wisdom of GOD,’) that He, I say, in the end of the world, was made man for our salvation; (for John himself having said, ‘In the beginning was the WORD,’ a little below said, ‘And the WORD was made flesh;’ as much as to say, He was made man). . . . . and having become man, and taken order for all things that appertained to Him as man, and having subdued and abolished our enemy, Death, sitteth now at the right hand of the FATHER, in whom He is, the FATHER being also in Him, as it was always, and is for ever. Now, this Form is from the Apostles through the Fathers<sup>1</sup>. For the rest, it is the duty of a reader of the Scripture to search and distinguish, when it speaks of the Godhead of the WORD, when, on the other hand, of His human attributes: that we may not err, taking the one for the other, which is the case of the Arians.” The same principle he more briefly expresses, though without the term *χαρακτήρ τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ*, in arguing against a refined form of heresy, the professing, namely, to abstract from all thoughts of our LORD’s human nature in our worship of His person: concerning which, having shown that it must end in the denial of the Incarnation, he adds<sup>2</sup>, “To the Heathen and Jews let us leave such madness and desperation: but to us belongs the right faith, *setting out* from the apostolical teaching and tradition of the Fathers, and *confirmed* both by the New and the Old Testament.” Could he have said more clearly, “Tradition teaches, Scripture proves?”

<sup>1</sup> Ὁ μὲν χαρακτήρ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν Ἀποστόλων διὰ τῶν πατέρων εἰς εἰς λαίπρον, ἐντελεχάνοντα τῇ γραφῇ, ἐκτιμάζειν καὶ διακρίνειν, κ. τ. λ.

<sup>2</sup> T. i. 914. E.

What is more, and yet nearer to our point, this same "Form of the Faith," for which, as we have seen, Athanasius looked to tradition, he affirms elsewhere to have been the very drift and scope of the Fathers in drawing up the Nicene Creed: and he himself, be it still remembered, had been among the foremost in that work. "This council<sup>1</sup>," says he, "in Nicæa, is truly a pillar set up with an inscribed warning against every kind of heresy. In this, such also as blaspheme against the HOLY GHOST, and call Him a creature, may find their refutation. For the Fathers, having spoken concerning faith in the SON, added presently, 'We believe also in the HOLY GHOST;' that professing the full and perfect faith in the Holy TRINITY, they might thereby make known *the Form of the Faith in CHRIST*, τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤΩ πίστεως, and the teaching of the Catholic Church. For it hath become manifest among you, and among all, and no Christian can have in his mind any doubt on this point; that our faith is not in the creature, but in GOD the FATHER Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible; and in one LORD JESUS CHRIST, His only-begotten SON; and in one HOLY GHOST: one GOD, Him who is known in the holy and perfect Trinity: into which faith having been baptized, and therein united to the Deity, we trust also to inherit the kingdom of heaven through JESUS CHRIST our LORD."

<sup>1</sup> Ep. ad Afros, t. i. 899. D. Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύνοδος, ἀληθῶς στηλογραφία κατὰ πάσης αἰρέσεως ἐστίν· αὕτη καὶ τοὺς βλασφημοῦντας εἰς τὸ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τὸ ἍΓΙΟΝ, καὶ λέγοντας αὐτὸ κτίσμα, ἀνατρέπει· εἰρηκότες γὰρ οἱ πατέρες περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν πίστεως, ἐπήγαγον εὐθύς πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τὸ ἍΓΙΟΝ· ἵνα τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τὴν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα πίστιν ὁμολογησάντες, ΤΟΝ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΑ ΤΗΣ ἘΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ, καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν τούτῳ γνωρίσωσι.

These passages put together seem to afford full and unexceptionable testimony as to the *principle* acted on at Nicæa. But it may be satisfactory to show, in one or two more cases, how completely this great theologian had made up his mind, that such was the only way of dealing with heretics. To Epictetus, Bishop of Corinth, who had transmitted to him certain heads of heretical opinions touching the person of our Lord, he gives the following advice, almost in the tone of reproof. "These <sup>1</sup>, it seems, were the subjects on which they were debating and contending with each other—the very persons who vaunt themselves in the confession of the Fathers, drawn up at Nicæa. But I, for my part, am inclined to wonder how Your Piety could endure them; and that you did not at once silence them uttering such words, and confront them with the Creed of the true religion; in order that on hearing it they might either hold their peace, or speaking against it, might be accounted as heretics. For the things above-mentioned were never spoken nor heard among Christians, but are altogether foreign to the teaching of the Apostles. This is the reason why I (if I may allege myself as authority) have caused their sayings, as they appear above, to be simply transcribed in my letter: so that any one who does but hear them, may perceive the shamefulfulness and impiety which is in them. And though it were necessary more at large to censure and expose the folly of such theorists, yet it were well that the letter should stop here, and no more be set down in writing. For things so evidently betraying their own vileness ought not to have any further labour or inquiry bestowed on them, lest those who are disputations begin to think they

<sup>1</sup> T. i. 903. B.

admit of a question. Or it may be right to reply to such words so far only as to say, 'It is enough that these things belong not to the Catholic Church, neither was this the mind of the Fathers.' Yet, lest through our entire silence the inventors of evil provide themselves with an excuse for their shamelessness, it may be well to rehearse a few places from the divine Scriptures, for the chance that being so put to shame they may cease from these their unclean imaginings." In like manner, arguing against Apollinarius, his first challenge is <sup>1</sup>, *πόθεν ὑμῖν κατηγγέλθη*; "Tell me, ye inventors of the new Gospel according to yourselves, (which is not another) *from what quarter* was it announced to you, that you should call the flesh [of our LORD] uncreated?" This emphatic question is asked after allegation of the Creed of Nicæa, (i. e. of the embodied tradition of the Church,) and comparison of the errors in question with it.

Proceeding to the few details which remain of what took place in the council, we find nothing to contradict and much to strengthen the idea, that not only St. Athanasius's doctrine, but also his mode of establishing it, was there sanctioned. One slight indication of this may seem to be afforded by an anecdote which Sozomen <sup>2</sup> (among others) has preserved. The Bishops, having arrived at Nicæa a few days before the opening of the council, had many conferences among themselves, (to which, it seems, Arius was also admitted,) on the best way of conducting the debate. "Some were for discouraging all innovation on the faith delivered down from the beginning; those especially whose simplicity of character taught them,

<sup>1</sup> I. 923. E.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. ii. § 17, 18. p. 431. Ed. Vales.

without nice inquiry, to accept the faith in God. Others were peremptory, that it was wrong without trial to follow after the more ancient opinions." In a word, the question lay between traditive and private interpretation. Which of the two prevailed, Sozomen does not expressly say; but he does say, that this preliminary discussion proved an effectual trial of the skill of the principal debaters on each side; and that from that time St. Athanasius, being there in attendance on Alexander, obtained the lead in the proceedings of the council. This does not look as if Athanasius had failed in the preliminary debate; and we know which side he must have taken in it. Moreover, Sozomen goes on to record, in immediate connection with this discussion, the well known anecdote of the aged and unlearned confessor, who silenced a pagan disputer, present at the council, by the bare recital of his baptismal Creed, adding these few sentences: "That these things are so, we believe without nice inquiry. Do not thou, then, labour in vain, seeking confutations of those who are exact in faith; and how it was or was not possible for these things to take place; but answer my question at once: Believest thou?" Upon this the philosopher, astounded, replies, 'I believe;' and, avowing his gratitude for his defeat, came over to the old man's opinions: and recommended to those who before felt with him to be of the same mind: affirming with an oath, that not without divine influence had this change taken place in him, but that he was urged to become a Christian by some ineffable power." Whether this account be correct in detail or no, that something of the kind took place is clear from the parallel report of Socrates<sup>1</sup>. "A little before

<sup>1</sup> I. 8. p. 20. D.

the assembling of the Bishops in council, the professors of disputation were exercising themselves beforehand in argument with whomsoever they met; and many found their reasoning attractive and pleasant. But a certain confessor, a layman, of a simple mind, opposes himself to the logicians, and says to them, CHRIST and His Apostles taught us not an art of disputation, nor any vain deceit, but a simple doctrine, the guard of which is faith and good works. On his so speaking, all who were present marvelled and received the saying: and the disputers, thinking better of it, remained quiet, the simple word of truth having been brought to their ears. The very next day the Bishops assembled.” Not to dwell on the possibility that here is something of a divine sanction given to the appeal to antiquity which our argument supposes; even the lowest statement, that of Socrates, (who had the evidence of an eye-witness to this among other things that passed at Nicæa<sup>1</sup>;) implies a decided preference there given to traditional over private interpretations. It shows what bias the Fathers were under the day before the council was holden.

There is another anecdote, still better accredited, which indicates the esteem in which the argument from antiquity was held among the orthodox at that time. The Novatianist Prelate in Constantinople, Acesius, being present at the Council, though not allowed to take part in it, was asked by the emperor, after the publication of the Creed, whether he also consented to this faith. “He replied, ‘It is no new matter, O emperor, which the synod hath determined; for so from of old, from the beginning, even

<sup>1</sup> Socr. i. 10. p. 39.

from the times of the Apostles, I have received the definition of the faith<sup>1</sup>.”

In the actual session, the council having been first opened by speeches from Eustathius, the Patriarch of Antioch, and the emperor Constantine, the next proceeding is related, by that Patriarch himself<sup>2</sup>, in these words: “When the question was put concerning the mode of faith, there was produced that paper, which, containing in it the blasphemy of Eusebius [of Nicomedia], was, in fact, a manifest conviction [of the same], which, being read before all, caused at first hearing inconceivable grief to the audience, τῆς ἐκτροπῆς ἕνεκα, *on account of its great deviation*; and brought incurable disgrace upon the writer.” This shows that a confession of faith was required from the innovators at least; and that, according to the statement of St. Athanasius quoted in the Sermon, it was met with a burst of censure at first hearing, as new and perverse.

But we have also a letter of Eusebius the historian<sup>3</sup>, tending to throw light on the mode of proceeding. It is addressed to certain upholders of the new opinions, and purports to explain the part which he, Eusebius, had taken in subscribing the Creed of the Homoöusion. “I have sent you herewith,” he says, “as the case required, first the written statement which I offered concerning the faith, afterwards the other, which they have published, with certain additions of their own to my expressions. My formula then, read in the presence of our gracious sovereign, and approved as good and genuine, stands thus.

<sup>1</sup> Soer. i. 10. p. 36; Soz. i. 22. p. 436; Gelasius ap. Concil. i. 425.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Theodoret. i. 7. Ὡς δὲ ἐξηγεῖτο τῆς πίστεως ὁ πρόπος, κ. τ. λ.

<sup>3</sup> Ap. Theodoret. i. 11; Soer. i. 3. p. 23; St. Athanas. i. 238.

‘As we have received from the Bishops before us, in our first catechetical instruction, and when we were baptized; as also we have learned out of the divine Scriptures, and (what is more) as we have both believed and taught in our offices of Presbyter and Bishop, so now also believing, we offer unto you our faith. We believe in one God,’ &c.’” (reciting the substance, and almost the words of the Nicene Creed, with the exception of the Homoöusion.) Having afterwards accounted for his reception of those clauses which were added at Nicæa, he finishes by declaring that he had assented to nothing which did not “appear evidently to concur with the confession which he had just made in the fore-recited formula.” This proves that Eusebius, at any rate, in any confession made or statement allowed by him at Nicæa, had respect to his baptismal Creed, and to the traditionary explanation of it received in his Church. He takes that as his groundwork, and appeals to the Scriptures for his proof. Now Eusebius was not a very likely person to adopt this mode of his own accord. It is well known that he delighted, perhaps to excess, in the exercise of his own learning and acuteness; that he was more apt to idolize talent than antiquity; and that his name has consequently become associated, whether justly or no, with a most dangerous kind of rationalism. So much the more probable is it, that he was guided in this instance by the general voice or feeling of the council.

<sup>1</sup> Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, καθὼς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἱπιστεύομεν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες, τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν προσαναφέρομεν, κ. τ. λ.

These things being well considered, it may perhaps not unreasonably be thought, that the custom which afterwards prevailed, of opening Church councils with a formal profession of faith, had its origin, or at least found sanction, in the proceedings at Nicæa. The Preface to the Arabic Version of the Nicene Canons, as translated by Bishop Beveridge, states that “the Confessions (*professiones*), discourses, and sentences of the several holy Fathers [there assembled], were preserved in fifteen books<sup>1</sup>.” The document referred to is most probably apocryphal; still there was evidently a tradition as to the form of their proceedings, agreeing in substance with what has now been advanced. Some centuries further back, (A. D. *circ.* 830,) Isidorus Mercator had inserted in the Preface to his Edition of the Councils<sup>2</sup> a kind of formulary for the holding of a synod; one of the directions of which is, that as soon as the synod has been regularly opened, “*collatio pariter et instructio de mysterio sanctæ Trinitatis habebitur, simulque et ordinibus officiorum, si in omnium sedibus ejusdem celebritatis unitas teneatur:*” *i. e.*, “A comparison and explanation shall take place concerning the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and also concerning the orders which relate to [ecclesiastical] offices: [to ascertain] whether or no unity be maintained in all the sees of the aforesaid assembly.” And a little below, that “on the three days of solemn supplication, with which the synod is to open, there shall be no business transacted, *nisi sola collatio de mysterio Sacrosanctæ Trinitatis, et de ordinibus sacris, vel officiorum institutis; ex-*

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Harduin. i. 526. E.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Præf. Isid. Merc. p. 7. B. C. Compare the Note at the end of this Postscript.

cepting the comparison [before mentioned] concerning the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, and concerning sacred orders, or regulations of offices."

Reverting to the course taken in particular councils: of what passed at the second general synod at Constantinople, A. D. 381, we have no detailed account. The council, in their report to the emperor Theodosius II., state themselves to have first renewed their concord, *ὁμολοίαν*, with one another<sup>1</sup>; which word *Concord* might seem to relate to their settlement of the disputes then existing about the see of Constantinople: but the narration of Socrates<sup>2</sup> shows that the comparison of doctrinal views preceded that arrangement; and in the course of it he twice uses the word to denote their consent in the orthodox faith. At all events, they have left it on record, that their adherence to the Nicene Creed was not without reference to the witness of the Church in all ages concerning the Creed of the apostolical times. "Whether it be persecutions, or afflictions, or threats from our sovereign, or cruelties from persons in office, or any other trial, which we have endured from the heretics, we endured it on behalf of the evangelical faith, as ratified in Nicæa by the three hundred and eighteen Fathers. For this must needs find acceptance, both with you and with us," (they are addressing their brethren, the Bishops of the Church Universal,) "and with all who pervert not the word of the true faith: being most ancient, and suitable to our Baptism, and teaching us to believe in the Name of the FATHER and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST<sup>3</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Harduin. i. 303. B.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. v. c. 8. p. 265.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. i. 325: Theodoret. E. II. v. 9. 'Ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἴτε διωγμούς, εἴτε θλίψεις, εἴτε βασιλικὰς ἀπειλὰς, εἴτε τὰς τῶν ἀρχόντων ὁμοσίητας,

The Nicene Creed, as enlarged at Constantinople, came, it seems, presently to be regarded as so complete a symbol of sound doctrine, that it superseded in general all necessity for a confession, to be made by each several Bishop, of the belief of himself and his church, at the first meeting of a council. Thus at Ephesus<sup>1</sup>, professing to observe the exact order of the canons, they entered on the doctrinal discussion by a solemn recitation of that Creed; "in order that all that might be said concerning the faith being compared with that exposition, such sayings as harmonized therewith might be received, and such as varied therefrom rejected." The expression of opinion at Chalcedon was still more remarkable. In the first session the emperor's commissioners proposed to begin the proceedings of the second by a written confession of faith on the part of the several Bishops<sup>2</sup>. "Let each boldly set down his faith in writing, having the fear of God before his eyes; with the understanding that our sovereign's own faith is guided by the confessions of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Fathers, and the canonical epistles and expositions of the holy Fathers, Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, and the canonical epistles of Cyril, which were read at Ephesus." Two days after, in the second ses-

εἴτε τινα πειρασμὸν ἑτερόν παρὰ τῶν αἰρετικῶν ὑπεμείναμεν, ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς πίστεως, τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ τῆς Βιθυνίας παρὰ τῶν τῶν πατέρων κυρωθείσης, ὑπέστημεν ταύτην γὰρ καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς μὴ διαστρέφουσι τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως συναρέσκειν δεῖ, πρεσβυτάτην οὖσαν, καὶ ἀκόλουθον τῷ βαπτίσματι, καὶ διδάσκουσαν ἡμᾶς πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ, καὶ τοῦ ΥἱΟΥ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ.

Concil. i. 1361. E.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 273. A.

sion, they renewed their proposition <sup>1</sup>. “The point,” they said, “which now demands our inquiry, judgment, and serious attention, is the reinforcement of the true faith. *That*, more than any thing else, is the object of the synod. Knowing, then, that to GOD Himself you will give account each for his own soul, and also for us all,—who desire to be rightly instructed in Christianity, and to have all doubt taken away by the concord and consent, and harmonious exposition and teaching, of the venerable Fathers,—give diligence without fear, favour or dislike, to set out the faith in its purity: so that those also, who, compared with the general body, appear to be otherwise minded, may, by acknowledgment of the truth, be brought back to unanimity.” To this, the Bishops replied by acclamation, “Other exposition [of the faith] no man maketh, nor do we endeavour nor dare to put forth any; for the Fathers have taught us, and the things set forth by them are preserved in writing; contrary to these we have no power to say any thing.” The acclamation was repeated more than once: “We make no fresh confession in writing: the canon forbids it: the old confession is enough: let the rules of the Fathers prevail:” which Florentius, Bishop of Sardis, enforced by the strong reason, that “it was not possible for them to write hastily on the faith, taught as they were to obey the holy Nicene council, and that which was rightly and religiously assembled at Ephesus.” Then was recited the Nicene Creed; whereupon their acclamation was <sup>2</sup>: “This we all believe; in this we were baptized,—in this we baptize. . . . this is the true faith; this is the holy faith; this

<sup>1</sup> Concil. ii. 284, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 288. A.

is the eternal faith . . . thus we believe, every one of us."

A reference to the councils would show other examples of the like especial deference paid to the Creed of Nicæa, as ratified by the four synods above mentioned<sup>1</sup>. One more only shall be here mentioned. The assembly at Trent, in their third session and first decree concerning the faith, "decrees and determines before all to begin by this confession of their faith; following herein, as they say, the examples of the Fathers, who, in their more venerable councils, when commencing business, have been wont to hold out this, as their shield against all heresies whatsoever<sup>2</sup>." Well had it been for them and for us, had they followed antiquity as religiously in all things!

So far, then, as the practice of other councils affords any presumption of what was done at Nicæa, we should expect to find that the Fathers looked in the first place to their Creeds before acknowledged, which as yet, perhaps, were mostly unwritten<sup>3</sup>; and did not set themselves, as though hitherto destitute of formularies, to the compiling of an entirely new one by their own judgment out of the Scriptures. And this expectation is confirmed by the substance of the Creed itself: which every child must perceive to be substantially the same formula with the old baptismal

<sup>1</sup> E. g. 2 Constantinop. t. iii. 70; 3 Tolet. t. iii. 471; Emerit. iii. 999; 11 Tolet. iii. 1019; 3 Bracarens. iii. 1031; 3 Constantinop. iii. 1060, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. x. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Compare St. Hilary writing to the bishops of Gaul: "Blessed are ye in the Lord, and glorious, who, retaining the perfect apostolical faith in the confession of the inward conscience, to this hour know nothing of written professions of faith." De Synodis. c. 63. p. 1187. Ed. Bened.

Creed,—the Creed of the Apostles<sup>1</sup>,—only expanded in the two points which specially required it. And as to those additions and explanations, they were indeed most carefully and reverentially *proved* from Scripture, yet even in them the Fathers went to Church Tradition<sup>2</sup> for the critical and decisive phrase, “of One Substance with the FATHER;” on which we have ever since mainly depended, as constituting one of our best securities against the profane conformity of heretics in heart.

These, and similar considerations, have appeared heretofore to learned men so decisive, that they have not scrupled to make such affirmations as the following<sup>3</sup>: “That ecclesiastical tradition, which Vincentius Lirinensis so much commends, did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. Now the unanimous consent of so many several Churches as *exhibited their confessions to the Nicene council*, being not dependent one of another, . . . . was a pregnant argument to any impartial understanding man, that this faith, wherein they all agreed, had been delivered unto them by the Apostles and their followers.” And again<sup>4</sup>: “The unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as *exhibited their several confessions*, catechisms, or testimonies of their own and their forefathers’ faith, unto the four first (Ecumenical councils, was an argument of the same force and efficacy against Arius and other

<sup>1</sup> See the Creeds of Alexander and Eusebius, as quoted before; and compare the accounts given by Tertullian and Irenæus; and Bp. Bull, *Jud. Eccl. Cathol.*, &c. § 4, 5, 6; with Grabe’s annotation.

<sup>2</sup> St. Ath. i. 230. *De Decr. Nic. Syn.* §. 25—27.

Jackson’s *Works*, iii. 892.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

heretics, for whose conviction those councils were called, as the general consent and practice of all nations in worshipping some divine power or other, hath been in all ages against the Atheists. . . . Nothing, besides the evidence of truth delivered unto the Christian world by CHRIST and His Apostles, would have kept so many several Churches as *communicated their confessions* to the councils of Nice and Ephesus, &c., in the unity of the same faith." Hear, again, Leslie, speaking of the provincial synod, which prepared the way for the proceedings at Nicæa. "This was the method taken in the council called at Alexandria against Arius: it was asked by Alexander, the Archbishop who presided, *Quis unquam talia audivit?*—'who ever heard of this doctrine before?' And it being answered by all the Bishops there assembled in the negative, it was concluded a novel doctrine, and contrary to what had been universally received in the Christian Church. Thus every doctrine may be reduced to fact: for it is purely fact, whether such doctrine was received or not<sup>1</sup>." Bishop Taylor says<sup>2</sup>: "It is not certain that the Nicene Fathers at their meeting recited any other Creed than the apostolical:" assuming that they recited some Creed.

And after all, though some doubt were still thought to hang on the exact order of their deliberations, their general rule is surely expressed, with sufficient plainness, and on unexceptionable testimony, in the three following passages of St. Athanasius. First, of the instinctive and inevitable comparison which the new doctrines underwent with those before received, he writes: "Who<sup>3</sup>, on hearing

<sup>1</sup> See below, *Caloca Patrum*, No. iii. p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> N. 462.

<sup>3</sup> *Orat. ii. ecclæ. Arrian*, i. 502. b.

the word SON, does not conceive in his mind the thought of identity of substance with the FATHER? Who, when he learned in his first Catechism, that GOD has a SON, and made all things by His own WORD, did not so receive it in his mind as we now understand it? Who, at the first origin of the impure heresy of the Arians, was not presently astounded at the mere hearing of their words, as at persons uttering strange things, and sowing a new seed, contrary to the Word sown in the beginning." Secondly, he presents the Creed to the emperor Jovian, not merely as the judgment of the present Church on the meaning of the Scriptures, but rather as her testimony to the fact, that "this faith had all along been known to all in the Church, being learned and read out of the divine Scriptures. For in this the saints, being perfected, endured martyrdom, and now are at rest in the LORD. And this faith would have continued throughout unimpaired, but for the wickedness of certain heretics, who have dared to pervert it . . . although our Fathers lost no time in assembling at Nicæa, and pronouncing the anathema on them. But the faith of the Catholic Church they professed in writing; so that by the proclaiming thereof everywhere, the heresy might be quenched which the perverse disputers had kindled<sup>1</sup>." Lastly, in respect of those portions of the Creed which appeared in some sense new, he is careful to show that for these also they had authority from antiquity, as well as proof from holy Scripture (thus acting on the very principle laid down in the English canon of 1571, to which reference has before been made): "The Fathers," says he, "inserted the clause of the SON's consubstantiality with the FATHER,

<sup>1</sup> I. 780.

and anathematised those who affirmed a diversity of substance, not in terms which they had framed for themselves, but which they too had learned from the Fathers before them . . . . which being so, the Creed of Nicæa is sufficient, agreeing as it does also with the ancient Bishops<sup>1</sup>." This shows in what light the framers of the Creed wished it to be viewed; and that the Church did so receive it, the words of Epiphanius (among others) may serve to testify: "They<sup>2</sup> professed the faith of the Fathers, orthodox and unswerving, and delivered down to us from the Apostles and Prophets."

Now if St. Athanasius and the Nicene Fathers were thus earnest and constant in resorting to tradition, in order to decide among conflicting interpretations of Scripture, and settle the fundamentals of our most holy faith; that circumstance alone is a sufficient answer to the suspicion, that reliance on Primitive Tradition leads of course to disparagement of Scripture. For certainly, if there be one among divines, ancient and modern, who commits his cause to the witness of Scripture more unreservedly than the rest, and expresses a deeper reverence in listening to its voice, and a more entire preparation of heart to follow whithersoever it shall lead him, that one is the great St. Athanasius. But the more unfeignedly he revered the Bible, and felt the necessity of obeying it in all things, the more thankfully did he avail himself of the greatest of providential helps to the right understanding of the Bible, the record of that faith which the New Testament itself assumes to have been taught to those for whose immediate use it was written. That record helps to explain the Scriptures, somewhat in the same way, and

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Afros*, §. 9. t. i. 898. C.

<sup>2</sup> Epiph. in *Hær. Arian.*

with the same kind of evidence, as the grammar of a language, once rightly taught, explains the sentences of that language. If truth and sound philological knowledge would be advanced by throwing aside the grammar rules which we have learned, and analysing sentences till we have constructed each a new grammar for ourselves, then, and not else, the proposition, that each man must make out his own Gospel from Scripture, discarding all confidence in traditional Creeds, may be tenable in common sense, whatever Piety may think of it. Why is the assurance of faith any more undermined by accepting a constant and practically infallible tradition, to the effect that what is to us the obvious meaning of the Bible, was always accounted its true meaning, than by accepting in like manner the similar traditions, that these books, and no other, are the Bible; that these words in English answer to the corresponding words in the sacred languages, out of which they profess to be translated? Indeed, were it not for Romish corruptions, it would not be at all easy to enter into the mind of those who feel concerning Primitive Tradition otherwise than as if it were a great and real help from above. See what it comes to in this case of the Nicene Creed. Had the interpretation and anathema therein contained been merely the deliberate judgment of the three hundred Bishops, undoubtedly this would have been a very material fact: more material, perhaps, considering all things, than the like assent at any other time: still the whole would have been matter, not of testimony, but of opinion, and could not have proved, in any sense, an end of controversy. It might still be said, as unthinking people now say, "Why should I submit my judgment to the judgment of three hundred persons assembled at Nicæa fifteen hundred years ago?"

However, as the matter stands, we have the full benefit of their judgment (for the remains of St. Athanasius alone are sufficient to show, that they fully and critically examined the Scriptures on all the disputed points): and we have moreover this greater—this unspeakable benefit; that by them has been preserved the irrefragable testimony of the Church to the fact, that the Apostles interpreted the Bible in this way, and held their interpretation to be fundamental.

The argument may be thus stated. Christians disagree among themselves which are the essential, fundamental truths of their religion. Now if we could know in what doctrine Theophilus (*v. g.*) to whom St. Luke wrote, had been catechised, we should know these fundamental truths: those truths which the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word did most emphatically deliver to their converts. Now of course the fundamentals taught to Theophilus were the same as those taught to other converts: they were, in short, the baptismal Creed. However that Creed might vary in terms, as it was occasionally delivered by the Apostles and their successors, it must have been the same in substance all over the world; being not so much the Creed of the several Apostles, as of that HOLY SPIRIT, by whom they were all alike guided. Can we any how ascertain the substance of that Creed? The council of Nicæa enables us to do so, practically and effectually—nay, infallibly. For the fact to which the three hundred prelates bore witness, was one in which they could neither be deceived themselves, nor be able to deceive others. They must have known each one of them the baptismal Creed of his own Church, and the interpretation of it there commonly received, and professed by himself in his letters communicatory when he first entered on his epis-

copate. They could not, therefore, be deceived themselves. Neither could they deceive others: for, (not to dwell on the evidence of sincerity which many of them had given, and some afterwards gave again, by enduring pain and privations for the Gospel's sake,) every Christian must have known his baptismal Creed, and every Bishop must have known what letters communicatory he had received from his newly-ordained brethren. Moreover, their testimony ranges far beyond those who were actually present in the council. They were in the nature of a representative body; and it may be remarked by the way, that the Church councils are perhaps the first decided instance in the world's history of the adoption of that mode of government. The three hundred and eighteen were but so many out of the eighteen hundred prelates of the Roman world, whom circumstances permitted to be present at the council; and their decisions were scrupulously communicated to their absent brethren, and formally approved by them, with very trifling exceptions. "Know, O prince beloved of Heaven," writes St. Athanasius to the emperor Jovian<sup>1</sup>, "that these things have been preached from the beginning, and this Creed the Fathers who assembled at Nicæa confessed; and to these have been awarded the suffrages of all the Churches every where in their respective places: both in Spain, and Britain, and Gaul, and all Italy and Dalmatia, Dacia and Mysia, Macedonia and all Greece; and in all Africa, and Sardinia, and Cyprus, and Crete, Pamphylia and Lycia, and Isauria, and those in Egypt and the divisions of Libya, and Pontus and Cappadocia, and those near us,

<sup>1</sup> I. 781. Even the Arian Philostorgius bore witness to their unanimity. *Ad calc. Theodoret. E. H.* 469. B. Ed. Vales.

and the Churches in the east, all besides a few persons who take part with Arius. For as to all the aforesaid, we know by their conduct what their judgment is; and moreover, we have their letters. And thou knowest that should there be some few who speak in opposition to this faith, they cannot create any prejudice against it, the whole world maintaining the apostolical Creed." We need not, therefore, hesitate to accept the Nicene formula as the testimony of all the Churches.

Any suspicion which might arise, of the proceedings having been tainted by political influence, is sufficiently obviated by what remains of Constantine's own correspondence at that time. Whether from ignorance, he being yet a catechumen and recent convert, or from the habit of looking at all things with the eye of a mere statesman, or from whatever reason, he was far, indeed, from entering into the views of St. Athanasius and those who acted with him. His language in the letter to Alexander, whereby he at first endeavoured to stifle the controversy, was such as this<sup>1</sup>: "A certain empty question, which ought neither to have been asked nor answered . . . an argument kindled not concerning any main point of the Divine commands, . . . no new heresy brought in . . . a dispute about matters trifling to an excess of insignificance . . . you may keep up communion with each other, however decidedly your opinions vary in some minute point of detail." And it is too well known how easily he was afterwards perverted by the arts of Eusebius. The agreement, therefore, among the Bishops was in no sort the result of state influence: it can only be explained by the

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Socr. i. 7. p. 15. D. E. 16. C. 17. C.

fact, that such was in reality the tenor of the traditional confessions of their several Churches.

Now such a harmony of statements all over the world, even beyond the limits of the Roman Empire (for the Indians too are mentioned as allowing the Creed<sup>1</sup>), admits of no account but a common origin; and that common origin can only be the first Gospel, as it was everywhere preached by Apostles and apostolical men. It is, in fact, a complete instance of successful application of the triple test of Vincentius. The "*ubique*" is insured by the council representing all Churches; the "*semper*," in each Church, by the succession of bishops, each receiving the Creed as a trust at his consecration; the "*ab omnibus*," by the like delivery of the same Creed to every Christian at his Baptism. The whole together constitutes an infallible tradition, of the same sort as that which induces us to receive the Scriptures themselves as genuine. And the comparison of it with Holy Scripture, which took place at Nicæa, and has been since repeated over and over, is the same kind of satisfactory confirmation to it, as when, in surveying a country, a line on being actually measured is found to be exactly of the length, which it ought to be on computation, perhaps through a long series of triangles. Such an operation strengthens the surveyor's confidence, on the one hand in the goodness of his instruments, on the other in the accuracy of his figures: just as the coincidence of Scripture and Tradition at Nicæa tends to prove (may we not say morally demonstrates?) both that the tradition is apostolical and that the interpretation is sound. Nor does it appear that the Arians of that time

<sup>1</sup> St. Ath. ad Afros, §. 2. αὕτη πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πεπλήρωκε· ταύτην ἔγνωσαν καὶ Ἰνδοὶ, καὶ ὅσοι παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις βαρβάροις εἰσι Χριστιανοί. i. 892. B.

often, if ever, questioned this broad statement of Church practice; they commonly satisfied themselves with metaphysical and critical objections to particular words in the Creed, or particular constructions of the text of Scripture.

Now because the Romanists make bold with the word Tradition on very different matters from this—mere instructions of a part of the present Church, in no wise able to stand the test of Vincentius, even supposing them uncontradicted in Scripture—are we therefore to throw aside or depreciate a Tradition, established as we see the Nicene Creed is? Can we fairly say it is of small use, either in confirming the natural interpretation of God's word, or in directing us what sort of points to esteem fundamental? Can any one of us soberly say, with any degree of confidence, where he himself might now have been without it? Take a case but too possible: suppose an inquiring person, not scholar enough to detect the falsehood and sophistry of the Arian and Socinian interpretations, nor to follow the argument when others detect them; must not this man rest his faith on Tradition? *i. e.* on the assurances of better scholars than himself, that the words of Scripture really mean what the Church says they do? And which Tradition would be safer and more consoling,—that of a few scholars and their writings, or that of the Apostolical Church, properly so called? Surely this latter, rightly understood, is a great blessing, and touches the foundation, and we cannot be too thankful for it. Surely men know not what they are doing, when they go about to shake our reliance on it.

In conclusion, a few words shall be offered to those who recoil from Tradition, not so much on argumentative grounds, as because they seem to feel that whatever is introduced, over and above the words of Holy Scripture, lessens the sacredness of any religious contemplation, and

hinders it from being altogether devotional. Such persons would do well to consider, whether the view which they deprecate would not tend to put them more entirely in possession of the words of Scripture, exempting them once and for ever from haunting doubts, and leaving them free to such thoughts as piety delights in. Let them once fairly endeavour to imagine themselves convinced that the Nicene Tradition is true and divine, and see what would then be their feelings on the subject. It would be with them in some measure as if a voice came from heaven, to say, This and this only is the meaning of the Scriptures touching the foundation of the faith. Were such a miracle to be vouchsafed, would it take away veneration from the Scriptures? Would it shake our confidence in them? Would it not be welcomed by some as a deliverance from doubt; by others as superseding in a great measure all necessity for that kind of critical discussion of God's Word, which is continually leading them into peril of irreverence; by all as a most merciful addition to the supernatural treasure of Faith and Hope? Now the case of the Nicene Tradition is perhaps as near an approach to the realization of this supposed miracle, as might consist with the ordinary course of God's moral government. Perhaps, had the evidence for it been more overpowering, no room would have been left for the requisite trial of our faith.

It follows, that we obtain in this way not only more entire conviction of understanding than if we were left to the unaided study of Scripture, but more also of that which is, on earth, Faith's appropriate sanction and encouragement—the reverential sense of the immediate presence of God. We discern an echo, as it were, of the divine voice, remote but unquestionable, and infallibly guiding us towards the true and only Temple:—a ray, not from Antiquity only,

but from the very Source of light, falling on the pages of the Bible, and bringing out in its full lustre that high and sacred Truth, which many might otherwise have failed to discern, and many more feared to enunciate. As things are, we see it so clearly that we can hardly understand how any one should ever miss it; and so, as in many other instances, the very abundance, anticipating our want, hinders our being duly thankful. But it is the part of Faith to remedy this; and the part also of Charity to remember our brethren, who feel, many of them, and own, their need of such guidance.

Of course, if so it had pleased Almighty God, the Scriptures might have been all clear of themselves; or their meaning might have been clearly revealed to individuals, at a certain stage of their progress in the Christian life: or there might be somewhere in the present Church an unerring court of appeal to fix their interpretation. Men may go on imagining the advantages of such a dispensation, until they have persuaded themselves that things are really so ordered. But theories of that kind, after all that can be said in their favour,—must they not incur the censure of true wisdom, as partaking of “that idle and not very innocent employment of forming imaginary models of a world, and schemes of governing it<sup>1</sup>?” How much better, humbly to acquiesce in God’s dispensations as we find them! How much more dutiful, with all seriousness to use our privilege of belonging to a Church, which on the one hand refers us to Scripture as the standard and treasure of all necessary doctrine, on the other hand “ties her doctors, as much as the Council of Trent does, to expound Scripture according to the consent of the ancient Fathers<sup>2</sup>!”

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Butler, *Pref. to Anal.* sub fine.

<sup>2</sup> Bp. Taylor’s *Works*, x. 322.

*Note, see page 133.*

It may be well to insert here the whole of the formulary for the opening of a synod, as it is given by Isidore, and from him by Hardouin in the Preface to his "Concilia," t. i. col. 6—10.

"The order according to which the sacred Synod should be held in the name of God.

"At the first hour of the day, before sunrise, let all be cast out of the church; and, the entrances being barred, let all the door-keepers stand at the one door, through which the Prelates are to enter. And let all the Bishops, assembling, go in together, and take their seats according to the time of their consecration. When all the Bishops have come in and taken their places, next let those Presbyters be summoned, whose admission the nature of the case in hand seems to warrant. And let no deacon intrude himself among them. After these, may be admitted the more eminent among the Deacons, whose presence is required by the regular form of proceeding. And a circle being made of the Bishops' seats, let the Presbyters sit down behind them: those, namely, whom the Metropolitan has selected to be his assessors; such, of course, as may act with him both in judging and in pronouncing sentence. Let the Deacons stand in sight of the Bishops: then let the laity also enter, who, by choice of the Council, have obtained the privilege of being there. Moreover, the notaries must also come in, as is directed by the regular form, for reading documents and taking notes. Then, the doors being fastened, and the Prelates sitting in long silence, and lifting up their whole heart to the LORD, the Arch-deacon shall say, Pray ye. And presently they shall all fall on their faces to the earth, as well the Bishops as the Presbyters; and they continuing long in silent prayer, with weepings and mournings, one of the elder Bishops shall arise, and pour out a supplication aloud unto the LORD, they all lying still on the ground. He shall say,

"Behold, we are here, O LORD the HOLY GHOST, we are here: bound indeed by our sinful nature as men, yet in Thy name especially assembled together. Come to us, and be Thou with us, and deign to pour Thyself into our hearts; teach us what we are doing, whither we are going; and show us what measures it is our duty to take: that, by Thine own aid, we

may be able to please Thee in all things. Be Thou alone both the Prompter and the Executor of our decisions. who alone, with GOD the FATHER and His SON, art possessor of the glorious Name. Suffer us not to be perverters of justice, Thou, who most exceedingly delightest in equity. Let not ignorance draw us the wrong way, nor favour bias us, nor acceptation of gift or person corrupt; but unite us to Thyself effectually, by the gift of that grace which is thine only: that we may be one in Thee, and in nothing swerve from the truth; so that, as we are assembled in Thy name, so we may in all things uphold Justice under the sway of Religion; so that here our sentence may in nothing depart from Thee, and in future for things well done we may obtain eternal rewards.'

In this supplication, the prayer of 'Our Father' is not to be recited, nor the blessing, but the supplication only itself to be confirmed [by an 'Amen.']

"But when there are more Metropolitans than one, then by another the following prayer is repeated.

"O LORD, who commandest us to speak justice, and to judge the things that are right; grant unto us, that neither iniquity be found in our mouth, nor corruption in our mind; that with a pure heart we join discourse yet more carefully purified; that justice may go forth in our doings, and no guile be found in our tongue.'

"And by the third Metropolitan, in the third place, the following prayer is recited.

"O LORD JESU, who hast promised by the sacred oracle of Thy Word, that where two or three are gathered together in Thy name, Thou wouldst vouchsafe to be present in the midst of them; be Thou graciously present in our assembly, and illuminate our hearts by Thy mercy; that we may so keep the straight path of righteousness, as not in any measure to err from the excellency of mercy.'

"Another:

"Unbind, O LORD, the chain of our souls, and break the bond of wickedness wherein we are held; that for our deliverance we may render praise to Thee, whose chastisement we fear for our transgressions.

"God, who willest that the truth should be spoken by the sons of men, and whose delight is, that they should deal purely in judgment; vouchsafe unto us to have an upright mind, that we may be able to utter with our lips the true justice.'

"The supplication being ended, and all having answered 'Amen,' the Archdeacon says again, 'Stand up.' Immediately let all arise, and with all fear of God, and orderly discipline, let Bishops and Presbyters both take their seats. And thus, all in their places sitting silently, a Deacon,

wearing the Albe, bringing forward in the midst the Book of the Canons, reads aloud the chapters on the manner of holding councils ; i. e. from the Third Council of Toledo, No. 18 : also, from the Canons of the Oriental Fathers, which Martin, [Bishop of Braga,] translated into Latin ; No. 18. *Of the manner of holding a Synod.* Also from the Fourth of Toledo, No. 3. Also from the Council of Chalcedon, No. 18. Also from the Council of Agatha, (Agde in Languedoc,) No. 25 or 26 : or any other of the Canons, which may seem to the Metropolitan fitter to be read. And the extract from the Canons being ended, the Metropolitan Bishop shall address the Council with an exhortation, thus saying :

“ Behold, most holy Prelates, having first offered our prayers to GOD, I present myself to your brotherhood with words of affectionate exhortation, and by the name of GOD beseech you, that whatsoever things you shall hear spoken by us, concerning the Deity, and concerning sacred orders, or religious conduct, you will receive with all piety, and with entire reverence strive to fulfil. Should it so happen that some one of you should differ from any opinion expressed, when we come all of us to mutual conference, let him, without any scruple about making disturbance, propose, to be conferred on again, the subjects of his scruple : in order that by God's favour he may either give or receive instruction. In the next place, with the like adjuration, I approach and entreat you, that none of you in judgment either accept persons, or depart from the truth, smitten by fear or favour. Take care that you handle so religiously whatever shall occur to be judged of by our assembly, that neither peevish contention, to the overthrow of justice, find any place among us, nor yet in long searching for equity, the vigour and vigilance of our order begin to grow lukewarm.’

“ After this exhortation, wherewith the Metropolitan is wont to address the whole synod, presently the King, with his nobles, enters into the Council ; and first, dismissing the attendant Bishops to a station behind him, turning to the altar, there says a prayer ; and the prayer being over, he turns to the Council and speaks. And, falling on his face to the ground, and then raising himself, he both recommends himself to the prayers of the Bishops, and also, addressing the whole Council, with religious exhortation urges on them the duty of acting by the highest rule of justice. His exhortation being ended, the Deacon says, ‘ Let us pray.’

“ Then, the King having turned to the east, let all the Prelates together fall prostrate as before ; and so let the following prayer, with the Lord's Prayer, be recited.

“ O GOD our King, who swayest the dominion of kings, by whose governance it is exalted, and by whose abandonment it groweth frail ; let

Thy servant N. have Thee present as his Director. Give unto him, O Lord, a right and firm faith, and never to grow weary of watching over Thy law. Let him so excel in uprightness of life, that he may be pleasing in the eyes of Thy Majesty: so rule over the nations in this life, that after his departure he may be crowned with the elect. Our FATHER,' &c.

*The Blessing.*

“ ‘Be thou blessed, most serene Prince, by the LORD of all Powers, and the Almighty God. *Amen.* May He inspire thee to do mercy, and [therewith] to temper justice. *Amen.* He who hath assigned to thee the kingdom, may He Himself keep thine heart unharmed from the mischiefs of all people. *Amen.* And thou in whose sight our assembly is venerable for the LORD’s sake, mayest thou, with all thine, after long ages, receive the crown. *Amen.* Through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who, with GOD the FATHER, and the HOLY GHOST, one GOD, is glorified for ever.’

“ This blessing having been pronounced, the Deacon says to him, ‘ In the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, depart in peace.’ Thereupon all shall answer, ‘ Thanks be to GOD.’ And immediately the King retires from the assembly of the Council.

“ After the departure therefore of the King, and the exhortation of the Archbishop beforementioned, shall enter in all who are Priests, Deacons, or in religious orders of any kind, to the hearing of the doctrinal discussion. Then the Archdeacon shall read the Canon of the Eleventh Council of Toledo, (No. 1,) against tumultuous excitement in councils. After the reading of this Canon, the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus shall be regularly read over; then a comparison and explanation shall take place concerning the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and also concerning the orders which relate to [ecclesiastical] offices; to ascertain whether or no unity be maintained in all the sees of the aforesaid assembly. In relation also to those causes, as the time of day may allow, shall be read the Epistles of Pope Leo to the Bishop Flavianus, concerning the errors of Eutyches and the mystery of the Trinity; the Canons also concerning unity of offices. Nor shall the Council pass to any other business, until all these have been gone through. Provided always that in the whole three days of solemn supplication nothing else be transacted or discussed, but only the comparison [before-mentioned] concerning the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, and concerning sacred orders, or regulations of offices, so as that these subjects be entirely gone through in the course of those three entire days: that, as aforesaid, nothing else be done, but simply the inquiry carried on which relates to the aforesaid matters: provided also that in every case

the proceedings commence with the reading of some document suitable to the order and cause which is to be discussed.

“ A Prayer to be said on the second day at the opening of the Council.

“ ‘ We bow unto Thee, O LORD, the knees of our hearts, and beseech Thee that we may obtain the blessings which we most need at Thy hands; namely, that walking in watchful care before Thee, we may be of exact judgment in the arduous discrimination [of doctrine], and loving mercy, may be eminent by zeal in such a course as shall please Thee.’

“ Also a Prayer, on the third day, rehearsed at the opening of the Council.

“ ‘ From Thee, O LORD, with the words of an inward cry, we ask with one accord, that, being strengthened by the countenance of Thy grace, we may be made fearless heralds of the Truth, and have power to speak Thy word with all boldness.’

“ After these things, on the fourth day, other causes shall be admitted in order. And thereupon all the religious persons, who on the former days had been present in the Council for spiritual instruction’s sake, shall go out; some Presbyters keeping their seats in the Council, whom the Metropolitan shall have appointed to that honour.

“ In any case, throughout the aforesaid three Litany days, both Bishops and Presbyters, with the Minister who bids the Prayers, shall begin by prostrating themselves in supplication. And then, after a collect, or a recapitulation of their prayers by the Metropolitan, they shall arise, and discuss, as was said, divine things only. But on other days, all standing by, the Collect shall be pronounced. And so sitting down they shall judge the matters brought in question. But let no disturbance be allowed, either among those who sit in the Council, or the by-standers.

“ Further, they are to enter into the Council each day in the same manner and order as is herein-before appointed. For the rest, whether they be other Presbyters or Deacons, Clerks or Laymen, not themselves members of the Council, who think themselves bound to appeal to it in any matter, let them give notice of their cause to the Archdeacon of the metropolitan church, and let him mention it to the Council; then let them severally be permitted to come in and state their case. But let none of the Bishops retire from the general assembly until the hour come for all to retire. Again, let no one presume to break up the Council, unless all things shall have been so determined, as that every point which has been settled by common consultation, is subscribed by the hand of every Bishop severally. Provided always, that two or three days before the Council be dissolved, they revise with diligent consideration all the Canons they have drawn up, lest haply they may have stumbled in something. Also, that on the day

appointed for the breaking up of the Council, the Canons which have been decreed in the holy Synod be read publicly before the Church. And when they are ended, there shall be a choral response of 'Amen.'

"Then returning to the place where they sat in Council, let them subscribe the same Canons. The Metropolitan also must give them notice concerning the next following Easter, on what day it comes on; also of the time in the next year when they shall come to hold Council. Certain of the Bishops, too, must be selected, to assist the Metropolitan in the celebration of the feasts of the Nativity and of Easter. After these things, the Archdeacon saying, 'Pray ye,' let all together cast themselves down on the ground; and when they have there prayed for a considerable time, let one of the seniors recite this prayer.

"'There is not, O LORD, in any conscience of man such virtue as may be able, without offence, to declare the judgments of Thy will. Therefore, seeing that Thine eyes have beheld our frailty, account it for perfection, we beseech Thee, that it is our chief wish to decide by the perfect rule of justice. Thee in our beginnings we did ask to meet us [with Thine aid]; Thee again in this termination of our decisions we beseech to be present, making allowance for our deviations. For why? to spare our ignorance; to allow for our wandering; to crown the full service of our prayers with full practical efficacy. And because, through the galling of our conscience, we pine away, fearing lest either ignorance should have drawn us into some error, or haply too eager will should have urged us to swerve aside from justice: for this we supplicate and beseech Thee, that if we have contracted any offence during the solemnization of this Council, by thy pardon we may find it venial; and that whereas we are about to give release from attendance on this assembled Council, we ourselves may first be released from all the bands of our own sins: so that as transgressors Thy pardon may attend us, and as confessing our faults to Thee, Thy eternal recompence.'

"To this prayer the prayer called Pater Noster shall be subjoined; and over them still prostrate the following blessing shall be pronounced.

"'CHRIST, the Son of GOD, who is the beginning and the end, vouchsafe unto you the fulness of charity. And may He who hath brought you safely to the completion of this Synod, cause you to be absolved from all infection of sin. *Amen.* So that, freed more entirely from all guilt, absolved also by the gift of the HOLY GHOST, you may return happily, and seek again unharmed the resting places of your own habitations. *Amen.* Which may He vouchsafe to grant, whose kingdom and dominion abideth for ever and ever. *Amen.*'

"These directions having been observed, and the Archdeacon having said, 'In the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, let us go in peace,' presently

all shall arise together, and the Metropolitan still keeping his seat, all alike, beginning from him first, shall mutually bestow on each other the kiss [of peace]. And thus, with the mutual giving and receiving of peace, the meeting of the Council shall be dissolved."

The above document most probably belongs to the good days of the Spanish Church, when it first recovered from Arianism. It must have been drawn up after the 11th Council of Toledo, A.D. 675, and apparently before 714, at which time the Saracens began to overrun Spain. This would settle its probable date within about 40 years.

THE END.

## TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

## CATENA PATRUM.

## No. III.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS IN THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH TO THE  
DUTY OF MAINTAINING QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB  
OMNIBUS TRADITUM EST.

THE following extracts from English Divines, are but expositions and comments upon the celebrated Tract of Vincentius Lirinensis<sup>1</sup> on Heresy, which has been so generally adopted by them, that it may justly be considered as the formal manifestation of our Church as regards all the controversies of the last three hundred years. In selecting them, it has been thought advisable, as in the two previous Catenas, not to include the writings of the Reformers of the 16th century, because the particular complexion of their opinions is the very subject keenly debated and claimed by opposite schools of opinion at the present day. It has been thought safer to show that the Succession of our Standard Divines ever since their times, understood them to hold that view of doctrine which it has been the endeavour of these Tracts to recommend; and that no other can be taken without contradicting both that illustrious Succession itself, and its judgment concerning the Reformers.

And in the next place, were the Reformers directly appealed to in these Catenas, it might be plausibly asked why the list stopped with them, and did not ascend to the generation

<sup>1</sup> This Tract has just been republished with a translation at Oxford, and should be carefully studied by all who wish to understand in what sense the English Church upholds tradition.

before them, as if they were to be considered the founders of our Church, instead of being as they are really, one link in a chain. No greater injury can be done them than to make it appear, (as is too often done at this day,) that they occupied or professed a position which belongs only to heretics, that of originating the faith they maintained. Against such a notion especially, the subject of the present selection of Testimonies is expressly directed ; in which it is maintained that no individuals, since the Apostles, are by themselves expositors of the will of Christ ; that the unanimous witness of Christendom is the only, and the fully sufficient, and the really existing guarantee of the whole revealed Faith ; that Catholicity is the only test of truth.

Considering the copiousness and value of the following extracts, the doctrine maintained in them need not here be discussed. With relation to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture it stands thus :—Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it ; Scripture is the document of Faith, tradition the witness of it ; the true Creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or Scripturally proved tradition ; Scripture by itself teaches mediately and proves decisively ; tradition by itself proves negatively and teaches positively ; Scripture and tradition taken together are the joint Rule of Faith.

Acknowledgment must here be made for the kind assistance of two friends of the compiler, who have supplied him with many valuable references.

*List of Authors cited.*

- |                                 |                            |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Jewell.                      | 22. Taylor.                |
| 2. Convocation of 1571.         | 23. Heylin.                |
| 3. The Queen's Council of 1582. | 24. Commissioners of 1662. |
| 4. Bilson.                      | 25. Pearson.               |
| 5. Hooker.                      | 26. Barrow.                |
| 6. Convocation of 1603.         | 27. Bull.                  |
| 7. Overall.                     | 28. Stillingfleet.         |
| 8. Morton.                      | 29. Kenn.                  |
| 9. Field.                       | 30. Beveridge.             |
| 10. White.                      | 31. Patrick.               |
| 11. Hall.                       | 32. Sharp.                 |
| 12. Laud.                       | 33. Potter.                |
| 13. Montague.                   | 34. Grabe.                 |
| 14. Jackson.                    | 35. Brett.                 |
| 15. Mede.                       | 36. Hicks.                 |
| 16. Ussher.                     | 37. Collier.               |
| 17. Bramhall.                   | 38. Leslie.                |
| 18. Sanderson.                  | 39. Waterland.             |
| 19. Cosin.                      | 40. Bingham.               |
| 20. Hammond.                    | 41. Jebb.                  |
| 21. Thorndike.                  | 42. Van Mildert.           |

JEWELL, BISHOP.—*A Sermon preached at Paul's Cross.*

YET are there some that whisper in corners, that the Mass is a blessed and a Catholic thing, and that the holy Communion, which now GOD of His great mercy hath restored to us, is wicked and schismatical, and therefore they murmur against it, therefore they refrain it, and will not come to it. O merciful GOD, who would think there could be so much wilfulness in the heart of man! O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierome, O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionyse! O Anacietus! O Sistus! O Paul! O CHRIST! if we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us. You have taught us these schisms and divisions, you have taught us these Heresies. Thus ye ordered the holy Communion in your time, the same we received at your hand, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people. And that ye may the more marvel at the wilfulness of such men, they stand this day against so many old Fathers, so many Doctors, so many examples of the primitive Church, so manifest and so plain words of the holy Scriptures, and yet have they herein not one Father, not one Doctor, not one allowed example of the primitive Church to make for them. And when I say, no one, I speak not this in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, but even as before GOD, by the way of simplicity and truth, lest any of you should haply be deceived, and think there is more weight in the other side, than in conclusion there shall be found. And therefore once again I say, of all the words of the holy Scriptures, of all the examples of the primitive Church, of all the old Fathers, of all the ancient Doctors, in these causes they have not one.

Here the matter itself that I have now in hand, putteth me in remembrance of certain things that I uttered unto you, to the same purpose, at my last being in this place. I remember I laid out then, here before you, a number of things that are now in controversy, whereunto our adversaries will not yield. And I said, perhaps boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as I myself and the learned of our adversaries themselves do

well know, sincerely and truly, that none of all them, that this day stand against us, are able, or shall ever be able to prove against us, any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the primitive Church, or by the old Doctors, or by the ancient general Councils.

Since that time it hath been reported in places, that I spake then more than I was able to justify and make good. However, these reports were only made in corners, and therefore ought the less to trouble me. But if my sayings had been so weak, and might so easily have been reproved, I marvel that the parties never yet came to the light, to take the advantage. For my promise was, and that openly here before you all, that if any man were able to prove the contrary, I would yield and subscribe to him and he should depart with the victory. Loth I am to trouble you with rehearsal to such things as I have spoken afore; and yet because the case so requireth, I shall desire you that have already heard me, to bear the more with me in this behalf. Better it were to trouble your ears with twice hearing of one thing, than to betray the truth of God. The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these: If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father, or out of any old general Council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after CHRIST; or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind; or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of the universal Church; or that the people was then taught to believe that CHRIST'S Body is really<sup>1</sup>, substantially, corporally, carnally or naturally in the

<sup>1</sup> Jewell must not be considered to differ from the words "verily and indeed" in our Catechism. He interprets "really" by "*carnally*;" the Catechism

Sacrament, &c. . . . If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council, or by any example of the primitive Church: I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.

These words are the very like, I remember, I spake here openly before you all. And these be the things that some men say, I have spoken and cannot justify. But I, for my part, will not only not call in any thing that I then said, (being well assured of the truth therein,) but also will lay more matter to the same: that if they that seek occasion, have any thing to the contrary, they may have the larger scope to reply against me.

Wherefore, besides all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet nothing so much as might be said. If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old Doctors and Councils, as I said before, that it was then lawful for the Priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself; or that the Priest had then authority to offer up CHRIST unto His Father: or to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another as they do, or to apply the virtue of CHRIST's death and passion to any man by means of the Mass: or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that the Mass *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin, &c. &c. . . . if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived<sup>1</sup>.—*Works*, pp. 57, 58.

opposes "verily and indeed" to *figuratively* and *nominally*. A mystical, spiritual, true, and positive presence of Christ's blessed Body and Blood, is at once not *carnal* and not *figurative*.

<sup>1</sup> Vide also *Apol.* pp. 43, 53—5, 62, 63. *Defence*, pp. 614—617.

CONVOCAION OF A.D. 1571.

They shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers, and ancient Bishops.—*Canon about Preachers.*

THE QUEEN'S COUNCIL. A.D. 1582.

IF the Papists shall show any ground of Scripture, and wrest it to their sense, let it be showed by the interpretation of the Old Doctors, such as were before Gregory I. But if they can show no Doctor that agreed with them in their said opinion before that time, then to conclude that they have no succession in that doctrine from the time of the Apostles, and above four hundred years after (when doctrine and religion were most pure), for that they can show no predecessor whom they might succeed in the same.—*Rules given to the Bishops; vide Strype's Whitgift, p. 98.*

BILSON, BISHOP.—*On Subjection and Rebellion.*

PHI. What one point of our Religion is not Catholic?

THEO. No one point of that, which this realm hath refused, is truly Catholic. Your having and adoring of images in the Church: your public service in a tongue not understood of the people: your gazing on the Priest while he alone eateth and drinketh at the LORD's table: your barring the people from the LORD's cup: your sacrificing the Son of God to His Father for the sins of the world: your adoring the elements of bread and wine with Divine honor instead of CHRIST: your seven sacraments: your shrift: your releasing souls out of Purgatory by prayers and pardons: your compelling Priests to live single: your meritorious vowing and performing pilgrimages: your invocation of Saints departed: your rules of perfection for Monks and Friars: your relying on the Pope as head of the Church, and

Vicar General unto CHRIST: these with infinite other superstitions in action, and errors in doctrine, we deny to have any foundation in the Scriptures, or confirmation in the general consent or use of the Catholic Church.

PHI. We stick not on your words, which you utter to your most advantage: but be not these things as we defend them, and you reject them, Catholic?

THEO. Nothing less.

PHI. What count you Catholic?

THEO. You were best define that: it toucheth you nearest.

PHI. I mean Catholic, as Vincentius doth, that wrote more than one thousand one hundred years ago.

THEO. So do I. And in that sense no point of your Religion, which this realm hath refused, is Catholic.

PHI. All.

THEO. None.

PHI. These are but brag.

THEO. Indeed they are so. Nothing is more common in your mouths than Catholic: and in your Faith nothing less.

PHI. Who proveth that?

THEO. Yourselves, who after you have made great stir for Catholic, Catholic, and all Catholic, when you come to issue, you return it with a *non est inventus*.

PHI. Will you lie a little?

THEO. I might use that sometimes, which is so often with you: but in this I do not.

PHI. I say you do.

THEO. That will appear, if you take any of those points which I have rehearsed.

PHI. Which you will.

THEO. Nay, the choice shall be yours, because the proof must be yours.

PHI. Take them as they lie. Having and worshipping of images in the Church, is it not Catholic?

THEO. It is not.

PHI. Eight hundred years ago the General Council of Nice, the second, decreed it lawful, and ever since it hath been used.

THEO. Catholic should have four conditions, by Vincentius' rule, and this hath not one of them. There can nothing be Catholic, unless it be confirmed two ways: first by the authority of God's law, and next by the tradition of the Catholic Church, not that the Canon of Scripture is not perfect and sufficient enough for all points of Faith, but because many men draw and stretch the Scriptures to their fancies, therefore it is very needful that the line of the Prophetical and Apostolical interpretation should be directed by the rule of the Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense. Now in the Catholic Church herself we must take heed we hold that which hath been believed at all times, in all places, of all persons, for that is truly and properly Catholic.

By this rule your erecting and adoring of Images in the Church is not Catholic. For first, it is prohibited by God's law: and where the text goeth against you, the gloss cannot help you. If there be no precept for it in the word of God, in vain do you seek in the Church for the Catholic sense and interpretation of that which is no where found in the Scriptures. If it be not Prophetical nor Apostolical, it cannot be Catholic nor Ecclesiastical.

Again, how hath this been always in the Church, which was first decreed seven hundred and eighty years after CHRIST? It is too young to be Catholic that began so late; you must go nearer CHRIST and His Apostles, if you will have it Catholic or ancient.

Thirdly; all places and persons did not admit the decrees of that Council. For besides Africa, and Asia the greater, which never received them, the Churches of England, France and Germany did contradict and refute both their actions and reasons. And in Greece itself not long before, a synod of three hundred and thirty Bishops at Constantinople condemned as well the suffering as reverencing of Images.—p. 546.

*Id.—Perpetual Government of Christ's Church.*

“Were the word of God in this point indifferent, which for aught I yet see is very resolute against them, the general consent

of all Antiquity, that never so expounded St. Paul's words, nor ever mentioned any Lay-Presbyters to govern the Church, is to me a strong rampire against all these new devices." . . . . "For my part what I find generally received in the first Church of Christ, I will see it strongly refuted before I will forsake it."—*Epistle to Reader, and p. 280.*

HOOKER, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*Ecclesiastical Polity.*

BUT our naming of JESUS CHRIST our Lord is not enough to prove us Christians, unless we also embrace that Faith which CHRIST hath published unto the world. To show that the Angel of Pergamus continued in Christianity, behold how the Spirit of CHRIST speaketh, "Thou keepest my name, and thou hast not denied my Faith:" concerning which Faith, "the rule thereof," saith Tertullian, "is one alone, immoveable, and no way possible to be better framed anew!" What rule that is, he showeth by rehearsing those few articles of Christian belief. And before Tertullian, Ireney: "The Church though scattered through the whole world, unto the utmost borders of the earth, hath from the Apostles and their Disciples received belief." The parts of which belief he also reciteth, in substance the very same with Tertullian, and thereupon inferreth, "This Faith, the Church being spread far and wide, preserveth, as if one house did contain them: these things it equally embraceth, as though it had even one soul, one heart, and no more: it publisheth, teacheth, and delivereth these things with uniform consent, as if God had given it but one only tongue wherewith to speak. He which amongst the guides of the Church is best able to speak, uttereth no more than this; and less than this the most simple doth not utter" when they make profession of their faith.—Book iii. § 1.

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1603.

. . . . Following the royal steps of our most worthy King, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scriptures and the practice of the Primitive Church, we do commend to all the true members of the Church of England, these our directions and ob-

servations ensuing. . . . The honour and dignity of the name of the cross begat a reverend estimation even in the Apostles' times (for aught that is known to the contrary), of the sign of the cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions. . . This use of the sign of the cross in baptism was held in the Primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. . . This continual and general use of the sign of the cross is evident by many testimonies of the ancient Fathers. . . But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical churches which were their first founders.—*Canon 30.*

OVERALL, BISHOP.—*Letter to Grotius.*

I believe there are few things in your book, which will not be approved by the Bishop of Ely (Launcelot Andrews) and the rest of our more learned Divines: unless, perhaps, they may hesitate respecting those passages which seem to give to lay powers a definitive judgment in matters of Faith; to deny the true power and jurisdiction of Pastors of the Church; and to rank Episcopacy among unnecessary things. For our Divines hold, that the right of definitive judgment, in matters of Faith, is to be given to Synods of Bishops, and other learned Ministers of the Church, chosen and convened for this purpose, according to the usage of the Ancient Church: who shall determine, from the Holy Scriptures, explained by the consent of the Ancient Church, and not by the rival spirit of Neoterics<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bp. Jebb's Pastoral Instructions, p. 306.

## MORTON, BISHOP.

I do therefore here solemnly profess, in the presence of Almighty God, that by His grace preventing and assisting me, I have always lived, and purpose to die, in the true Catholic Faith wherein I was baptized; firmly believing all the Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament, and fully assenting to every article of all those three Creeds, (commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Athanasian Creed,) which in the Ancient Church were accounted the adequate rules of Faith, and have accordingly been received as such, by the Church of England.

As for Councils, that are free and generally consisting of competent persons, lawfully summoned, and proceeding according to the word of God, such as were the four first, viz. those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon; I do reverence them as the supreme tribunals of the Church of CHRIST upon earth, for judging of heresies, and composing differences in the Church. And as I utterly condemn all heresies that have been condemned by any of them, so I heartily wish that all the present differences in the Church of God might be determined by such a free General Council, as any of those four were already mentioned.—*His last Will*<sup>1</sup>.

FIELD, PRESBYTER.—*Of the Church.*

For first, we receive the number and names of the authors of books Divine and Canonical, as delivered by tradition. This tradition we admit, for that, though the Books of Scripture have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, but win credit of themselves, and yield sufficient satisfaction to all men, of their Divine truth, whence we judge the Church that receiveth them, to be led by the Spirit of God; yet the number, authors, and integrity of the parts of these Books, we receive as delivered by tradition.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Christian Remembrancer, Nov. 1823, p. 658.

The second kind of tradition which we admit, is that summary comprehension, of the chief heads of Christian doctrine, contained in the Creed of the Apostles, which was delivered to the Church, as a rule of her Faith. For though every part thereof be contained in the Scripture, yet the orderly connexion and distinct explication of these principal articles gathered into an epitome, wherein are implied, and whence are inferred all conclusions Theological, is rightly named a tradition. The third, is that form of Christian doctrine, and explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians receiving of the same Apostles, that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterities. This may rightly be named a tradition, not as if we were to believe anything without the warrant and authority of the Scripture, but for that we need a plain and distinct explication of many things, which are somewhat obscurely contained in the Scripture : which being explicated, the Scriptures which otherwise we should not so easily have understood, yield us satisfaction that they are so indeed, as the Church delivereth them unto us.

The fourth kind of tradition, is the continued practice of such things, as neither are contained in the Scripture expressly, nor the examples of such practice expressly there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice, be there contained, and the benefit, or good that followeth of it : of this sort is the Baptism of Infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture, that the Apostles did baptize infants, nor any express precept there found, that they should so do. Yet is not this so received by bare and naked tradition, but that we find the Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it. The fifth kind of tradition, comprehendeth such observations, as in particular, are not commanded in Scripture, nor the necessity of them from thence concluded, though in general without limitation of times, and other circumstances, such things be there commanded. Of this sort, many think, the observation of the Lent fast to be, the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and some other. . . .

Thus having set down the kinds and sorts of traditions, it

remaineth to examine, by what means we may come to discern, and by what rules we may judge, which are true and indubitate traditions. The first rule is delivered by Augustine; *quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolicâ traditum, rectissime creditur.* Whatsoever the whole Church holdeth, not being decreed by the authority of Councils, but having been ever holden, may rightly be thought to have proceeded from Apostolic authority. The second rule is, whatsoever all, or the most famous and renowned in all ages, or at the least in diverse ages, have constantly delivered, as received from them that went before them, no man contradicting or doubting of it, may be thought to be an Apostolical tradition. The third rule, is the constant testimony of the Pastors of an Apostolic Church, successively delivered: to which some add the present testimony of an Apostolic Church, whose declinings when they began, we cannot precisely tell. But none of the Fathers admit this rule. For when they urge the authority and testimony of Apostolic Churches, for the proof, or reproof of true or pretended traditions, they stand upon the consenting voice, or silence, of the Pastors of such Churches, successively in diverse ages concerning such things. Some add the testimony of the present Church: but we inquire after the rule, whereby the present Church may know true traditions from false; and besides, though the whole multitude of believers, at one time in the world, cannot err pertinaciously, and damnably, in embracing false traditions instead of true; yet they that most sway things in the Church may, yea even the greater part of a general Council; so that this can be no sure rule for men to judge of traditions by. And therefore Canus reasoneth foolishly, that whatsoever the Church of Rome practiseth, which she may not do without special warrant from God, and yet hath no warrant in Scripture so to do, the same things and the practice of them she hath received by tradition. He giveth example in the present practice of the Romish Church, in dispensing with, and remitting vows and oaths, and in dissolving marriages, (not consummated by carnal knowledge,) by admitting men into orders of Religion. But this

practice of the Romish Church, we condemn, as wicked and Antichristian.—pp. 375. 378.

#### WHITE, BISHOP.

The Holy Scripture is the fountain and living spring, containing in all-sufficiency and abundance the pure water of life, and whatsoever is necessary to make God's people wise unto salvation. The consentient and unanimous testimony of the true Church of CHRIST in the primitive ages thereof, is *canalis*, a conduit-pipe to derive and convey to succeeding generations the celestial water contained in the Holy Scriptures, . . . The Ecclesiastical story reporteth of Nazianzen and Basil, that in their studying the Holy Scriptures they collected the sense of them, not from their own judgment or presumption, but from the testimony and authority of the ancients, who had received the rule of the true intelligence of Scripture from the Holy Apostles by succession. . . . The reformed Churches reject not all traditions, but such as are spurious, superstitious, and not consonant to the prime rule of faith, to wit, the Holy Scripture ; but genuine traditions, agreeable to the rule of faith, subservient to piety, consonant with holy Scripture, derived from the Apostolical times by a successive current, and which have the uniform testimony of pious antiquity, are received and honoured by us. Now such are those which follow the historical tradition concerning the number, integrity, dignity, and perfection of the books of Canonical Scripture, the Catholic exposition of many sentences of Scripture, the Apostles' Creed, the baptism of infants, the perpetual virginity of the blessed Virgin Mary, the righteous observation of the Lord's Day, and some other Festivals, as Easter, Pentecost, &c. baptizing and administration of the holy Eucharist in public assemblies and congregations, the service of the Church in a known language, the delivering of the Communion to the people in both kinds, the superiority and authority of Bishops over Priests and Deacons in jurisdiction and power of ordination, &c. —*On the Sabbath*, pp. 12. 14. 97.

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Conc. ad clerum.* 1623.

In truth he who heartily subscribes to the Word of God, consigned, as it is, to the everlasting record of letters, to all the primitive Creeds, to the four General Councils, to the concordant judgment of the Fathers for the first six hundred years from Christ, which we of the Reformed Church religiously profess to do, even though he be not exempt from error in minor points, yet he shall never be an heretic. Any particular Church may easily err, by affixing heresy to an opinion undeserving of it, whether a truth, or but a light error; but heavily neither soul nor Church can err, which walks heedfully in the steps of the universal and ancient Church.

LAUD, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.—*Conference with Fisher.*

The third particular I consider is, Suppose in the whole Catholic Church Militant, an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to Salvation; and that this power of not erring so, is not communicable to a General Council, which represents it, but that the Council is subject to error. This supposition does not only preserve that which you desire in the Church, an infallibility, but it meets with all inconveniences, which usually have done, and daily do perplex the Church. And here is still a remedy for all things. For if private respects, if bandies in a faction, if power and favour of some parties, if weakness of them which have the managing, if any unfit mixture of State Councils, if any departure from the rule of the Word of God, if any thing else sway and wrench the Council; the whole Church upon evidence found in express Scripture, or demonstration of this miscarriage, hath power to represent herself in another Body, or Council, and to take order for what was amiss, either practised, or concluded. So here is a means without any infringing any lawful authority of the Church, to preserve or reduce unity, and yet grant, as I did, and as the Church of England doth, that a General Council may err: and

this course the Church heretofore took ; for she did call, and represent herself in a new Council, and define against the heretical conclusions of the former, as in the case at Ariminum, and the second of Ephesus, is evident ; and in other Councils named by Bellarmine. Now the Church is never more cunningly abused than when men out of this truth, that she may err, infer this falsehood, that she is not to be obeyed. For it will never follow she may err, therefore she may not govern. For he that says, " Obey them which have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls" (Heb. xiii. 17.), commands obedience, and expressly ascribes rule to the Church. And that not only a Pastoral power, to teach and direct, but a Prætorian also, to controul and censure too, where errors or crimes are against points fundamental, or of great consequence, else St. Paul would not have given the rule of excommunication, (1 Cor. v.) Nor CHRIST Himself have put the man that will not hear and obey the Church into the place and condition of an Ethnic and a Publican, as He doth, (Matt. xviii.) And Solomon's rule is general, and he hath it twice : My son, forsake not the teaching or instruction of thy mother. Now this is either spoken or meant of a natural mother ; and her authority over her children is confirmed, (Ecclus. iii.) And the fool will be upon him that despiseth her, (Prov. xv.) or 'tis extended also to our Mystical and Spiritual Mother, the Church, and so the general note upon the place expresses it. And I cannot but incline to this opinion, because the blessings which accompany this obedience are so many and great, as that they are not like to be the fruits of obedience to a natural mother only, as Solomon expresses them all, (Prov. vi.) And in all this here is no exception of the Mother's erring. For *Mater errans*, an erring Mother loses neither the right nor the power of a Mother by her error. And I marvel what Son should show reverence or obedience if no Mother that hath erred might exact it. 'Tis true, the Son is not to follow his Mother's error, or his Mother into error. But 'tis true too, 'tis a grievous crime in a Son to cast off all obedience to his Mother, because at some time, or in some things she hath fallen into error. And howsoever this consideration meets with this incon-

venience, as well as the rest, for suppose (as I said) in the whole Catholic Militant Church an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to salvation: and then, though the Mother Church, provincial or national, may err, yet if the Grand Mother, the whole Universal Church, cannot in these necessary things, all remains safe, and all occasions of disobedience taken from the possibility of the Church's erring, are quite taken away. Nor is this Mother less to be valued by her children because in some smaller things age had filled her face fuller of wrinkles. For where 'tis said, that CHRIST makes to Himself a Church without spot or wrinkle, (Eph. v.) that is not understood of the Church Militant but of the Church Triumphant. And to maintain the contrary is a branch of the spreading Heresy of Pelagianism. Nor is the Church on earth any freer from wrinkles in Doctrine and Discipline than she is from spots in Life and Conversation.—p. 256.

#### MONTAGUE, BISHOP.

Where is it bidden in Scripture to baptize infants, or to administer to communicants in the Lord's Supper under both kinds? There are ever so many such instances in sacred matters, instituted by GOD, committed to the Church, practised by the Church, of which notwithstanding it may be declared, Scripture teacheth nothing such, Scripture does not preach these things.—*Orig. Eccles. ii. 67. p. 396.*

#### JACKSON, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*On the holy Catholic Faith and Church.*

The three special notes of the Catholic Faith or Church, by him required, are Universality, Antiquity and Consent. Whether these three members be different or subordinate, and oftentimes coincident, I leave it to be scanned by Logicians. According to the author's limitation, all three marks agree to us, not to the Romanist.

First, concerning Universality, the question is not, whether at

this present time, or in any former age for these thousand years past, there are or have been more, which profess the present Romish Religion established in the Church of Rome, than the Religion established in the Reformed Churches since the separation was made. If we should come to calculate voices after this manner, whether will you be a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant : they might, perhaps, have three for one amongst such as profess themselves Christians, ready to cry, I am not for the Protestants ; but for the Roman Catholics will I be. But it was far from Vincentius his meaning, that Universality should be measured after this fashion ; for he very well knew that the Arian faction had prevailed especially by this tumultuary kind of canvass or calculation. The multitude of voices thus taken for them, may prove their faction to be stronger and greater than our Church ; it cannot prove their Faith to be so universal as our Faith is. The fallacy by which the Romanists deceive poor simple people, is in making them believe, that our Religion and their Religion, our Faith and their Faith are *duo prima diversa*, or so totally distinct, that part of the one could not be included in the other. But for the universality of our Faith we have every member of the Roman Church a suffragant or witness for us. First, nothing is held as a point of Faith in our Church, but the present Romish Church doth hold the same, and confess the same to have been held by all orthodoxal antiquity. So that for the form of Faith established in our Church, we have the consent of the Primitive Church, of the four first General Councils, of all succeeding ages unto this present day, the consent likewise of the present Romish Church, and of ourselves. Now as France is a great deal bigger than Normandy, if we compare them as distinct and opposite, and yet France and Normandy is bigger than France without Normandy : so likewise though the present visible Romish Church be much greater than the Church of England, yet seeing the Romish Church, how great soever, doth hold all the points of Faith which our Church doth, for Catholic and orthodoxal ; our consent, and their consent, our confession and their confession, is more universal than their consent without ours. But if their consent unto the points of Faith believed by

us, prove our Faith to be universal, and our Church by consequence to be Catholic; why should not our consent unto the points of Faith believed by them, prove their Faith to be universal, or their Church to be Catholic? Because it is not enough to hold all points of Catholic Faith, unless the same points be kept holy and undefiled. The Romish Church, we grant, doth hold all points of Catholic Faith, and so far as she holds these points, we dissent not from her: yet dissent from her we do in that she hath defiled and polluted the Catholic Faith, with new and poisonous doctrines; for which she neither hath the consent of antiquity, nor of the Reformed Churches. And in respect of these doctrines, she stands convicted of schism and heresy, by Vincentius his rules. For it is with him a fundamental rule, that no present visible Church, hath any authority to commend anything as a point of Faith to posterity, which hath not been commended to the said Church by antiquity derived from the Apostles' times. A proficiency or growth in Faith, he allows and granteth, *modò sit in eodem genere*, so it be in the same kind, or proceed from the same root; but for additions or new inventions, he takes them for the marks of schism and heresy.

So then we hold the Catholic Faith, and they hold the Catholic Faith. And seeing they hold the Catholic Faith in the same measure that we do, is it not reason they should be termed Catholics as well as we, though not so good Catholics as we? No reason they should be termed Catholics at all. Where is the difference? In this. We hold it pure and undefiled, they have defiled and polluted it for many generations, and do still defile it with many loathsome additions and inventions. Now in this case the denomination followeth the worser part, that is, they are not so much to be reputed Catholics for that they hold the Catholic Faith, as to be adjudged heretics and schismatics, because they have defiled and polluted it with many new inventions, and being admonished hereof and reprov'd, will not purify their Faith, will not reform their religion according to the rule of Faith and the practice of antiquity. Their Faith not purified from the additions of the second Nicene and Trent Council, can

be no Catholic Faith. Their religion not reformed, can be no true religion, save only in reference to Paganism, Judaism, or Mahometism. For as Dionysius saith, *Bonum non est nisi ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu*. Nothing is good which is not entire and sound, evil ariseth from every defect. Every new addition or invention in matters of Faith or Doctrine, is enough to make that Church schismatical, which before was Catholic and orthodoxal. Catholic and orthodoxal no Church can be, unless it hold all points of Faith without admixture of human inventions or of new articles. The admixture of a great deal of man's meat with a little swine's meat, makes the whole dish to be no man's meat, but swine's meat. Our Church according to Vincentius his rule admits a growth or proficiency in Faith, in that it holds not only those propositions which are expressly contained in Scripture, but such as may by necessary consequence be deduced out of them, for points of Faith, and this growth is still in *eodem genere*, from the same root. Other points of Faith besides these, our Church admitteth none, but ties even her Prelates and Governors, to obtrude no other doctrines as points of Faith upon their auditors, than such as are either expressly contained in Scriptures, or may infallibly be deduced from them. And this is the fundamental and radical difference between our Church and the Romish Church, which admitteth such an illimited increase or growth of Faith as is in heaps or congests of Heterogeneals.

The pain-worthiest inquiry in this argument, were first to make search what additions, or adinventions unto the ancient or primitive Canon of Catholic Faith have been made, received or authorized by the Romish Church, since the Council of Ephesus, which was some three years before Vincentius Lirinensis wrote his admonitions concerning this point; and in what age and upon what occasions, such additions have been made or received. Secondly, to make proof or demonstration, how far and in what manner such additions do corrupt or contaminate the holy Catholic Faith; and how far each or all of them, jointly or severally, do undermine or overthrow the holy Catholic Faith.

The first addition or adinvention of moment, which comes into my memory, is the invocation of Saints and veneration of images. Both which points were added as Articles of Faith or parts of the Creed, which all were bound to believe and profess by Tharasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and President of that illiterate, parasitical and factious assembly, which hath been commonly styled the seventh general or second Nicene Council. In these and the like abominable decrees the then Bishop of Rome was Tharasius's accomplice, his instigator and abettor, as may appear from the speeches of his Legates in that Council, and by his own Epistles, although part of the Epistle may be justly suspected to have been framed since. But by what spirit this Council was managed, or in whose name they met together. I refer the reader unto that learned Treatise in the Book of Homilies (whereunto we have all subscribed) concerning the peril of idolatry, especially the third part. What ingenuous minds of this kingdom thought of that Council, before either the author of these Homilies or Luther was born, may in part be gathered from an ancient English Historiographer, who saith the Church of God did hold this decree in execration.

The selfsame points, with a great many more of like or worse nature, all whatsoever any council which the Romish Church accounteth general or œcumenical, or any Canons which the same Church accounteth Catholic, even all decrees whereto the Trent Council hath affixed their Anathemas, have been annexed by Pius Quartus to the Nicene Creed, and are inserted as principal points of that oath which every Roman Bishop at his consecration is to take ; one part of which oath or solemn vow it likewise is, that every Bishop shall exact the like confession of his inferiors to be ratified by oath or solemn vow, *Cætera omnia à sacris, &c.*

The particular decree concerning invocation of Saints and adoration of images, is much enlarged by the Trent Council, and by Pius Quartus. But of the equivalency of idolatry in Rome Heathen, and Rome Christian, elsewhere at large. In this one point, to omit others, the present Romish Church far exceeds the

Eastern Church, in the time of the second Nicene Council, in that it ratifies the worshipping of all such Saints as are canonized by the Pope.

The second addition made by the Roman Church unto the ancient Canon of Faith, is a transcendant one, and illimited; and that is, the making of Ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the Canon of Faith. This doth not only pollute, but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic Faith. That there is a certain rule or authentic Canon of Faith, is a principle, wherein the ancient primitive Church, the modern Roman, and all reformed Churches agree. The first point of difference betwixt us, is about the extent of the written Canon, especially of the old Testament. The main points of difference are these. First, we affirm with antiquity, and in particular with Vincentius Lirinensis, that the Canon of Scripture is a rule of Faith, perfect for quantity, and sufficient for quality; that is, it contains all things in it, that are necessary to salvation, or requisite to be contained in any rule; and so contains them as they may be believed and understood, without relying on any other rule or authority equivalent to them in certainty, or more authentic in respect of us, than the Scriptures are. The modern Romish Church denies the Canon of Scripture to be perfect and complete in respect of its quantity, or sufficient for its quality or efficacy. To supply the defect of its quantity, they add tradition, as another part of the same rule, homogeneal and equivalent to it for quality. To supply the insufficiency as well of Canonical Scriptures as of tradition in respect of their quality or efficacy towards us, they add the infallible authority of the present visible Church. The former addition of unwritten tradition as part of the infallible rule doth undermine: this latter addition of the Church's infallible and absolute authority as well in determining the extent, as in declaring the true sense and meaning of the whole rule, utterly pulls down the structure of Faith: yet when we reject Ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of Faith, we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it. Howbeit that Ecclesiastical tradition, whereof there was such excellent use in the primitive

Church, was not unwritten tradition, or customs commended or ratified by the supposed infallibility of any visible Church. That Ecclesiastical tradition which Vincentius Lirinensis so much commends, did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. Now the unanimous consent of so many several Churches, as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, being not dependent one of another, not overruled by authority, nor misled by faction to frame the confessions of their Faith by imitation, or according to some pattern set them, but voluntarily and freely exhibiting such confessions as had been framed and taught before these controversies arose, was a pregnant argument to any impartial, understanding man, that this Faith wherein they all agreed, had been delivered unto them by the Apostles and their followers, by the first planters of the Churches thus agreeing; a pregnant argument, likewise, that these first planters had been inspired and taught by one and the same Spirit. Each particular Church was a competent or authentic witness of every other Church's integrity and fidelity *in servando depositum*, in carefully preserving the truth committed to their special trust. On the contrary, in that Arius, Eutyches, Nestorius, and other Heretics, did obtrude such constructions of Scriptures upon their auditors as had nowhere been heard of before, but sprung up with themselves, or from the places where they lived, this was an argument more than probable, that if the Apostles had delivered the whole form of wholesome doctrine unto posterity, (a point questioned by no Church in those times) these men, or the particular Churches which abetted them, had not kept the doctrine delivered unto them by our SAVIOUR and His Apostles; but had corrupted or defiled it with the idle fancies of their own brains, or with the muddy conceit of their discontented passions.

To speak more briefly, though perhaps more fully: the unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as exhibited their several confessions, catechisms, or testimonies of their own and their forefathers' Faith, unto the four first Ecumenical Councils, was an argument of the same force and

efficacy, against Arius and other Heretics, for whose conviction these Councils were called, as the general consent and practice of all nations in worshipping some Divine power or other, hath been, in all ages, against the Atheists. Nothing, besides the ingrafted notion of a Deity or Divine power, could have inclined so many several nations, so much different in natural disposition, in civil discipline and education, to affect or practice the duty of adoration. Nothing besides the evidence of truth delivered unto the Christian world by CHRIST and His Apostles, could have kept so many several Churches, as communicated their confessions unto the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, &c. in the unity of the same Faith.

Howbeit this unanimous tradition Ecclesiastic, was not in these times held for any proper part of the rule of Faith, but alleged only as an inducement to incline the hearts of such as before acknowledged the written word for the only rule of Faith, to believe that the interpretations or decisions of those Councils, did contain the true sense and meaning of the rule acknowledged by all. So that the written tradition which Vincentius so much commends, was not by the Nicene Council used to any such purpose as the Romanists now use unwritten traditions. The only use of it was to direct the present Church in her examination of the Catholic truth, or points of Faith. The chief authority which the visible Church then challenged, did consist in the unanimous consent of the Ecclesiastic tradition, and that (as was said before) but an inducement to embrace the interpretations of the present Church, and reject the interpretations of upstart Heretics.

But was it a received truth in these primitive times, or a truth acknowledged by Vincentius, (the pretended patron of Roman Catholic tradition) that the joint consent of so many Bishops, as were assembled in the first Council of Nice, or the joint confessions of so many several Dioceses as were then delivered to that Council, should unto the world's end, continue an argument or inducement of like force or validity, as it then was, either for establishment of the Canons which succeeding Councils should make, or for condemning such opinions as with the consent of

as many (or more) Bishops, as were there assembled, should be condemned for Heresies? No, the same Vincentius hath given posterity a caveat, as full of wisdom, as of religion; in some cases not to admit of his former admonition, concerning the trial of Catholic Faith, either for refelling Heresies, or for establishing the truth. The limitation of his former admonition is, in his own words, thus. As for ancient and inveterate Heresies, they are not in any wise to be refuted by the former method, because continuance of time (after Heresies be once set on foot) may afford Heretics many opportunities of stealing truth out of the writings of the ancient, or for exchanging orthodoxal antiquity with profane novelties.

Now what opportunities of falsification did these eight hundred years last past afford, which the Roman Church was not always ready to take? The opportunities afforded by dissolution of the Roman Empire and variance of Christian Kings, first made the Roman Clergy such sacrilegious thieves, as Vincentius supposeth any opportunity may make Heretics to be. And the Roman Church, being flesht with the spoil of CHRIST'S flock and Christian Churches through the West, have not been wanting unto themselves in devising new opportunities in coining a new act of falsifying antiquity, of stealing the consent and suffrages of the Christian world, from orthodoxal and primitive truth. So that if this controversy may be examined and discussed by Vincentius's rules, since the first acknowledgment of the Pope's supremacy, since the making of edicts for the acknowledging of it, since the exemption of Clerks from royal or civil jurisdiction; all the written testimonies, or unwritten traditions, which the children of the Romish Church do or can rake together, are void in law, and void in conscience: there is not so much as one legal single testimony, but all are as a multitude of false and illegal witnesses, of parties or conspirators in their own cause.

But although Heresies of long standing and continuance cannot be refuted, nor may not be assaulted, in Vincentius's judgment, by the former method, that is, by multitude of suffragants, or joint consent of several Provinces, is there therefore no other

means left to convince them, no way left to eschew them? Yes, we may eschew them, (saith he), as already condemned by ancient and orthodox Councils; or we may convince them, so it be needful or expedient, by the sole authority of Scriptures. Now if the Scriptures be sufficient to convince Heresies of long continuance or long standing, and to confute such Heretics, as want neither wit, will, nor opportunity to falsify ancient records, and imprint traditions of their own coining with inscriptions of antiquity, I hope the same Scripture was (in Vincentius's judgment) a rule of Faith neither incomplete for its quantity, nor insufficient for its quality: a rule every way competent for ending controversies in Religion, without the assumption either of tradition or Decrees of Council, as any associates or homogeneal parts of the same rule.

Unto what use then did Ecclesiastical tradition, or general Councils serve for quelling Heresies? Ecclesiastical traditions or unanimous consent of particular Churches throughout several Kingdoms or Provinces in points of Faith, was in ancient times and yet may be an excellent means, by which the Spirit of God leads general Councils into the truth. And the Councils whose care and office it was to compare and examine traditions exhibited, were the sovereign and principal means, under the guidance of God's Spirit, by which as many as embraced the love of truth, were led into all those truths, which are at all times necessary to salvation, but were much questioned and obscured by the jugglings and falsifications of former Heretics. Into the same truths which these Councils were then, we now are led, not by relying upon the sole authority of the Councils which the Spirit did lead, but by tracing their footsteps, and viewing the way by which the Spirit did lead them. And this was, by necessary deductions or consequences, which reason, enlightened by the Spirit, and directed by the sweet disposition of Divine Providence, did teach them to make, and doth enable us to judge that they were truly made by them. — Vol. iii, p. 888.

MEDE, PRESBYTER.—*Epistle lxxxi. to Mr. Hartlib.*

It grieves me not a little, yea perplexes me, to hear that Mr. Dury is come off with no better success from my L . . . . I am loth *malè augurari* ; but I like it not. I fear it is *mali ominis*, and that our State and Church have no mind to put their hand to this work : *Deus avertat omen !* But our Church, you know, goes upon differing principles from the rest of the Reformed, and so steers her course by another rule than they do. We look after the form, rites and discipline of antiquity, and endeavour to bring our own as near as we can to that pattern. We suppose the Reformed Churches have departed farther therefrom than needed, and so we are not very solicitous to comply with them ; yea, we are jealous of such of our own as we see over-zealously addicted to them, lest it be a sign they prefer them before their Mother. This, I suppose, you have observed, and that this disposition in our Church is of late very much increased. Well then, if this union sought after be like to further and advantage us in the way we affect, we shall listen to it. If it be like to be prejudicial, as namely to give strength and authority to those amongst us who are enamoured with the foreign platform, or bring a yoke upon our own by limiting and making us obnoxious ; we'll stand aloof and not meddle with it, lest we infringe our liberty.—*Works*, book iv. p. 865.

USSHER, ARCHBISHOP.—*On the Universality of the Church of Christ.*

That the multitude of teachers dispersed over the world, without any such dependency or correspondency, should agree together in laying the foundations of the same faith, is a special work of God's Spirit. And it is "the unity of the spirit" which the Apostle here speaketh of, and exhorteth us to "keep in the bond of peace." Whereas the unity of which our adversaries boast so much (which is nothing else but a wilful suffering of themselves to be led blindfold by one man, who commonly is

more blind than many of themselves) is no fruit of the Spirit, but of mere carnal policy ; and may serve, peradventure, for a “bond of peace” betwixt themselves and their own party, such as the priests of Antichrist were to have, and as many as would be content to yield themselves to the conduct of such a commander, but hath proved the greatest block that ever stood in the way for giving impediment to the peace and unity of the universal Church, which here we look after. And therefore Nilus, Archbishop of Thessalonica, entering into the consideration of the original ground of that long-continued schism, whereby the West standeth as yet divided from the East, and the Latin churches from the Greek, wrote a whole book purposely on this argument, wherein he sheweth “that there is no other cause to be assigned of this distraction, but that the Pope will not permit the cognizance of the controversy unto a General Council, but will needs sit himself as the alone teacher of the point in question, and have others hearken unto him as if they were his scholars ; and that this is contrary both to the ordinances and the practice of the Apostles and the Fathers.” Neither indeed is there any hope that ever we shall see a general peace for matters of religion settled in the Christian world, as long as this supercilious master shall be suffered to keep this rule in God’s house, how much soever he be magnified by his own disciples, and made the only foundation upon which the unity of the Catholic Church dependeth.

Now in the next place, for the further opening of the “unity of faith,” we are to call unto mind the distinction which the Apostle maketh betwixt the *foundation* and that which is *builted thereupon*, betwixt the *principles of the doctrine of CHRIST* and that which he calleth perfection. The “unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God” here spoken of hath reference, as we have heard, to the foundation ; as that which followeth, of a “perfect man,” and “the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST,” to the superstruction and perfection. In the former there is a general *unity* among all true believers ; in the latter a great deal of *variety* ; there being several degrees of perfection to be found in several persons, “according to the measure of the gift of CHRIST.” So we see in a material building that still there

is but one foundation, though great disparity be observed in sundry parts of the superstruction; some rooms are high, some low, some dark, some lightsome, some more substantially, some more slightly builded, and in tract of time some prove more ruinous than others; yet all of them belong to one building, as long as they hold together and stand upon the same foundation. And even thus is it in the spiritual building also, whether we respect the *practical* part of Christianity or the *intellectual*. In the practical we see wonderful great difference betwixt Christian and Christian; some by God's mercy attain to a higher measure of perfection, and keep themselves unspotted from the common corruptions of the world: others watch not so carefully, &c.

The oracles of God contain abundance of matter in them, and whatsoever is found in them is a fit subject for faith to apprehend; but that all Christians should uniformly agree in the profession of those truths that are revealed there, is a thing that rather may be wished than ever hoped for. Yet the variety of men's judgments in those many points that belong to theological faith, doth not dissolve the unity which they hold together in the fundamental principles of the Catholic faith. The "unity of faith" commended here is a Catholic unity, and such as every Christian attaineth unto. "Till we ALL come in the unity of faith," saith the Apostle. As there is a *common salvation*, so is there a *common faith*, which is *alike precious* in the highest Apostle and the meanest believer. For we may not think that heaven was prepared for deep clerks only, and therefore beside that larger measure of knowledge whereof all are not capable, there must be "a rule of faith common to small and great," which, as it must consist of few propositions (for simple men cannot bear away many), so is it also requisite that those articles should be of so much weight and moment, that they may be sufficient to make a man "wise unto salvation;" that howsoever in other points learned men may go beyond common Christians, and exceed one another likewise by many degrees, yet in respect of these radical truths which is the necessary and common food of all the children of the Church, there is not an unity only but such a kind of equality also, brought in among all sorts of Christians, as was heretofore

among the congregation of the Israelites in the collection of their manna, where "he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack."

If then salvation by believing these common principles may be had, and to salvation none can come that is not first a member of the Catholic Church of Christ, it followeth thereupon, that "the unity of the faith" generally requisite for the incorporating of Christians into that blessed society is not to be extended beyond those common principles which may further be made manifest unto us by the continual practice of the Catholic Church herself in the matriculation of her children and the first admittance of them into her communion; for when she prepared her Catechumeni for baptism, and by that door received them into the congregation of Christ's flock, we may not think her judgment to have been so weak that she should omit anything herein that was essentially necessary for the making of one to be a member of the Church. Now, the profession which she required of all that were to receive baptism, was for the *Agenda*, or practical part, an ab-renunciation of the devil, the world, and the flesh, with all their sinful works and lusts; and for the *Credenda*, the things to be believed, an acknowledgment of the Articles of the Creed; which being solemnly done, she then baptized them "in this faith;" intimating thereby sufficiently that this was that "one faith" commended unto her by the Apostles, as the other that "one baptism" which was appointed to be the Sacrament of it.

This Creed, though for substance it was the same every where, yet for form was somewhat different, and in some places received more enlargements than in others.

That which in the time of the ancient Fathers was accounted to be "truly and properly Catholic," namely, "that which was believed everywhere, always, and by all," that in the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved, and is at this day entirely professed in our Church. And it is well observed by a learned man, who hath written a full discourse of this argument, that "Whatsoever the father of lies either hath attempted or shall attempt, yet neither hath he hitherto effected, nor shall ever bring it to pass hereafter, that this Catholic doctrine, ratified by the

common consent of Christians always and everywhere, should be abolished; but that in the thickest mist rather of the most perplexed troubles it still obtained victory, both in the minds and open confession of all Christians, no ways overturned in the foundation thereof; and that in this verity that one Church of Christ was preserved in the midst of the tempests of the most cruel winter, or in the thickest darkness of her wanings."

Thus, if at this day we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, as of the religion of the Roman and the Reformed Churches in our quarters, of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians in the south, of the Grecians and other Christians in the eastern parts, and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they all did generally agree, we should find, that in those propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained as, being joined with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that "as many as do walk according to this rule," (neither overthrowing that which they have builded by superinducing any *damnable heresies* thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their "*holy faith*" with a lewd and wicked conversation) "peace shall be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

Now these common principles of the Christian faith, which we call *κοινὸπιστά* or things *generally believed* of all, as they have "universality," and "antiquity," and "consent," concurring with them, which by Vincentius's rule are the special characters of that which is truly and properly Catholic; so for their duration we are sure that they have still held out, and been kept as the seminary of the Catholic Church in the darkest and difficultest times that ever have been: where, if the Lord of hosts had not in his mercy reserved this seed unto us, we should long since "have been as Sodom, and should have been like unto Gomorrah." It cannot be denied indeed, that Satan and his instruments have used their utmost endeavour either to hide this light from men's

eyes by keeping them in gross ignorance, or to deprave it by bringing in pernicious heresies ; and that in these latter ages they have much prevailed both ways, as well in the West and North as in the East and South. Yet far be it, for all this, from any man to think that “ God should so cast away his people,” that in those times, there should not be left “ a remnant according to the election of Grace.”

The Christian Church was never brought unto a lower ebb than was the Jewish synagogue in the days of our Saviour CHRIST, when, &c. pp. 700—713.

BRAMHALL, ARCHEISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Answer to de la Militiere.*

If your intention be only to invite his Majesty to embrace the Catholic Faith, you might have spared both your oil and labour. The Catholic Faith flourished one thousand two hundred years in the world, before Transubstantiation was defined among yourselves. Persons better acquainted with the Primitive times than yourself (unless you wrong one another) do acknowledge that the Fathers did not touch either the word or the matter of Transubstantiation. Mark it well, neither Name nor Thing. His Majesty doth firmly believe all supernatural Truth revealed in Sacred Writ. He embraceth cheerfully whatsoever the holy Apostles, or the Nicene Fathers, or blessed Athanasius, in their respective Creeds or Summaries of Catholic Faith did set down as necessary to be believed. He is ready to receive whatsoever the Catholic Church of this Age doth unanimously believe to be a particle of saving Truth.

But if you seek to obtrude upon him the Roman Church, with its adherents, for the Catholic Church, excluding three parts of four of the Christian world from the communion of CHRIST ; or the Opinions thereof, for Articles and Fundamentals of Catholic Faith, neither his reason, nor his Religion, nor his Charity, will suffer him to listen unto you. The truths received by our Church, are sufficient, in point of Faith, to make him a good Catholic. More than this, your Roman Bishops, your Roman

Church, your Tridentine Council, may not, cannot, obtrude upon him. Listen to the Third General Council, that of Ephesus, which decreed, that it should be lawful for no man to publish or compose another Faith or Creed than that which was defined by the Nicene Council; and that whosoever should dare to compose or offer any such to any persons willing to be converted from Paganism, Judaism, or Heresy, if they were Bishops or Clerks, should be deposed; if Laymen, should be anathematised.

Suffer us to enjoy the same Creed the Primitive Fathers did, which none will say to have been insufficient, except they be mad, as was alleged by the Greeks in the Council of Florence. You have violated this Canon, you have obtruded a New Creed upon Christendom. Now I say, not in words only, but in sense also.

Some things are *de Symbolo*, some things are *contra Symbolum*, and some things are only *præter Symbolum*. Some things are contained in the Creed, either expressly or virtually, either in the letter or in the sense, and may be deduced by evident consequence from the Creed, as the Deity of CHRIST, his Two Natures, the Procession of the Holy Ghost. The addition of these was properly no addition, but an explication; yet such an explication, no person, no assembly, under an Œcumenical Council, can impose upon the Catholic Church. And such an one your Tridentine Synod was not.

Secondly, some things are *contra Symbolum*, contrary to the Symbolical Faith, and either expressly or virtually overthrow some article of it. These additions are not only unlawful, but heretical also in themselves, and after conviction render a man a formal Heretic; whether some of your additions be not of this nature, I will not now dispute.

Thirdly, some things are neither of the Faith, nor against the Faith, but only besides the Faith; that is, opinions or truths of an inferior nature, which are not so necessary to be actually known; for though all revealed truths be alike necessary to be believed when they are known, yet all revealed truths are not alike necessary to be known. It is not denied, but that General or Provincial Councils may make constitutions concerning these for

Unity and Uniformity, and oblige all such as are subject to their jurisdiction to receive them, either actively, or passively, without contumacy or opposition. But to make these, or any of these, a part of the Creed, and to oblige all Christians under pain of damnation to know and believe them, is really to add to the Creed, and to change the Symbolical, Apostolical Faith, to which none can add, from which none can take away, and comes within the compass of St. Paul's curse : "If we, or an angel from Heaven, shall preach unto you any other Gospel (or Faith) than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." Such are, your universality of the Roman Church, by the institution of CHRIST, (to make her the Mother of her Grandmother the Church of Jerusalem, and the Mistress of her many elder Sisters) your doctrine of Purgatory and Indulgences, and the worship of Images, and all other Novelties defined in the Council of Trent, all of which are comprehended in your New Roman Creed, and obtruded by you upon all the world to be believed upon pain of damnation. He that can extract all these out of the old Apostolic Creed, must needs be an excellent chymist, and may safely undertake to draw water out of a pumice.—*Works*, p. 22.

Concerning the proper expounders of Scripture, we do believe that the Gospel doth not consist in the words, but in the sense ; *non in superficie, sed in medullâ* ; and therefore that, though this infallible rule be given for the common benefit of all, yet, every one is not an able or fit artist to make application of this rule, in all particular cases. To preserve the common right, and yet prevent particular abuses, we distinguish judgment into three kinds :

Judgment of Discretion ; Judgment of Direction ; and Judgment of Jurisdiction.

As in the former instance of the law (the ignorance whereof excuseth no man) every subject hath judgment of discretion, to apply it particularly to the preservation of himself, his estate and interest ; the advocates, and those who are skilful in the law, have moreover a judgment of direction, to advise others of less knowledge and experience ; but those who are constituted by the sovereign power, to determine emergent difficulties, and

differences, and to distribute and administer justice to the whole body of a Province or Kingdom, have moreover a Judgment of Jurisdiction, which is not only discretionary, or directive, but authoritative, to impose an obligation of obedience unto those who are under their charge. If these last shall transgress the Rule of the Law, they are not accountable to their inferiors, but to him or them that have the Sovereign power of Legislative Judicature; *Ejus est legem interpretari, cujus est condere.*

To apply this to the case in question concerning the exposition of the Holy Scripture. Every Christian keeping himself within the bounds of due obedience and submission to his lawful superiors, hath a Judgment of Discretion; "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." He may apply the rule of Holy Scripture for his own private instruction, comfort, edification, and direction, and for the framing of his life and belief accordingly. The Pastors of the Church (who are placed over God's people as watchmen and guides) have more than this, a Judgment of Direction, to expound and interpret the Holy Scriptures to others, and out of them to instruct the ignorant, to reduce them who wander out of the right way, to confute errors, to foretell dangers, and to draw sinners to repentance. The chief Pastors, to whose care the regiment of the Church is committed in a more special manner, have yet an higher degree of judgment, a Judgment of Jurisdiction, to prescribe, to enjoin, to constitute, to reform, to censure, to condemn, to bind, to loose, judicially, authoritatively, in their respective charges. If their Key shall err, either their key of knowledge, or their key of jurisdiction, they are accountable to their respective superiors, and in the last place to a General Council, which under CHRIST, upon earth, is the highest Judge of controversies. Thus we have seen what is the Rule of Faith, and by whom, and how far respectively, this Rule is to be applied.—

This hath always been the doctrine, and the practice of our English Church; First, it is so far from admitting Laymen to be Directive Interpreters of Holy Scripture, that it allows not this liberty to clergymen so much as to gloss upon the text until they be licensed to become preachers. Secondly, for Judgment of

Discretion only, it gives it not to private persons above their talent, or beyond their last. It disallows all phantastical and enthusiastical presumption of incompetent and unqualified expositors. It admits no man into Holy Orders, that is, to be capable of being made a Directive Interpreter of Scripture, howsoever otherwise qualified, unless he be able to give a good account of his faith in the Latin tongue, so as to be able to frame all his expositions according to the analogy thereof. It forbids the licensed preachers to teach the people any doctrine as necessary to be religiously held and believed, which the Catholic Fathers, and Old Bishops of the Primitive Church have not collected out of the Scriptures. It ascribes a Judgment of Jurisdiction over Preachers to Bishops, in all manner of Ecclesiastical Duties, as appears by the whole body of our Canons. And especially where any difference or public opposition hath been between Preachers about any point or doctrine deduced out of Scripture. It gives a power of determining all emergent controversies of Faith above Bishops to the Church, as to the witness and keeper of the Sacred Oracles; and to a lawful Synod, as the representative Church.

We receive not your upstart supposititious traditions, nor unwritten Fundamentals; but we admit Genuine, Universal, Apostolical Traditions; as the Apostles' Creed, the Perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the Anniversary Festivals of the Church, the Lenten Fast. Yet we know that both the duration of it, and the manner of observing it, was very different in the Primitive times. We believe Episcopacy, to an ingenuous person, may be proved out of Scripture without the help of tradition; but to such as are froward, the perpetual practice and tradition of the Church, renders the interpretation of the text more authentic, and the proof more convincing. What is this to us who admit the practice and tradition of the Church, as an excellent help of exposition? Use is the best interpreter of laws, and we are so far from believing, that we cannot admit tradition without allowing the Papacy, that one of the principle motives why we rejected the Papacy, as it is now established with Universality of Jurisdiction, by the Institution of CHRIST, and superiority above Ceu-

menical Councils, and Infallibility of Judgment, was the constant tradition of the Primitive Church.—*Works*, p. 33.

*Vindication of the Church of England.*

The Communion of the Christian Catholic Church is partly internal, partly external. The internal Communion consists principally in these things : To believe the same entire substance of saving necessary truth revealed by the Apostles, and to be ready implicitly in the preparation of the mind to embrace all other supernatural verities when they shall be sufficiently proposed to them : to judge charitably one of another ; to exclude none from the Catholic Communion and hope of Salvation, either Eastern, or Western, or Southern, or Northern Christians, which profess the ancient Faith of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers, established in the first General Councils, and comprehended in the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds ; to rejoice at their well-doing, to sorrow for their sins, to condole with them in their sufferings, to pray for their constant perseverance in the true Christian Faith, for their reduction from all their respective errors, and their reunion to the Church in case they be divided from it, that we may be all one sheep-fold under that One Great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls ; and lastly, to hold an actual External Communion with them *in votis*, in our desires, and to endeavour it by all those means which are in our power. This Internal Communion is of absolute necessity among all Catholics.

External Communion consists first in the same Creeds, or Symbols, or Confessions of Faith, which are the ancient badges or cognizances of Christianity. Secondly, in the participation of the same Sacraments. Thirdly, in the same external worship and frequent use of the same Divine Offices, or Liturgies, or Forms of serving God. Fourthly, in the use of the same public Rites and Ceremonies. Fifthly, in giving communicatory letters from one Church, or one person, to another. And lastly, in admission of the same discipline, and subjection to the same Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority, that is, Episcopacy, or a General Council : for as single Bishops are the heads of particular

churches, so Episcopacy, that is, a General Council, or (Ecumenical Assembly of Bishops, is the head of the Universal Church.—*Works*, p. 57.

*Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's Survey.*

No man can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual Mother the Church of England, in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die. Bees, by the instinct of nature, do love their hives, and birds their nests. But God is my witness that, according to my uttermost talent and poor understanding, I have endeavoured to set down the naked truth impartially, without either favour or prejudice, the two capital enemies of right judgment. The one of which, like a false mirror, doth represent things fairer and straighter than they are; the other like the tongue, infected with choler, makes the sweetest meats to taste bitter. My desire hath been to have truth for my chiefest friend, and no enemy but error. If I have had any bias, it hath been desire of peace, which our common SAVIOUR left as a legacy to His Church, that I might live to see the reunion of Christendom, for which I shall always bow the knees of my heart to the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. It is not impossible but that this desire of unity may have produced some unwilling error of love, but certainly I am most free from the wilful love of error. In questions of an inferior nature, CHRIST regards a charitable intention much more than a right opinion.

Howsoever it be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, First, to the judgment of the Catholic (Ecumenical Essential Church, which if some, of late days, have endeavoured to hiss out of the schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church out of human frailty or ignorance, (which, for my part, I have no reason in the world to suspect; yet it is not impossible, when the Romanists themselves are divided into five or six several opinions, what this Catholic Church, or what their Infal-  
libile Judge is) I do implicitly, and in the preparation of my mind,

submit myself to the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of CHRIST, the Mother of the Saints, the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is firmer to the Infallible Rule of Faith, that is, the Holy Scriptures, interpreted by the Catholic Church, than to mine own private judgment or opinions; although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet this cordial submission is an implicit retraction thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by the Father of mercies, both from me and all others who seriously and sincerely do seek after Peace and Truth.

Likewise I submit myself to the representative Church, that is, a free General Council, or so general as can be procured; and until then to the Church of England wherein I was baptized, or to a National English Synod. To the determination of all which, and each of them respectively, according to the distinct degrees of their authority, I yield a conformity and compliance, or at the least, and to the lowest of them, an acquiescence.

Finally, I crave this favour from the courteous reader, that because the surveyor hath overseen almost all the principal proofs of the cause in question, (which I conceive not to be so clearly and candidly done,) he will take the pains to peruse the vindication itself. And then in the name of God let him follow the dictate of right reason. For as that scale must needs settle down whereinto most weight is put, so the mind cannot choose, but yield to the weight of perspicuous demonstration.—*Works*, p. 141.

### *Schism guarded.*

The great bustling in the controversy concerning Papal power, or the Discipline of the Church, hath been either about the true sense of some texts of Holy Scripture; as, “thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and to thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven”, and “feed my sheep”: Or about some privileges conferred upon the Roman See by the Canons of the Fathers, and the Edicts of Emperors, but pretended by the Roman Court, and the maintainers thereof, to be held by Divine right. I endeavour in this treatise to disabuse thee, and to shew that this challenge of Divine right is but a

blind, or diversion, to withhold thee from finding out the true state of the question. So the hare makes her doubles and her jumps before she comes to her form, to hinder tracers from finding her out.

I demonstrate to thee, that the true controversy is not concerning St. Peter, we have no formed difference about St. Peter, nor about any point of Faith, but of interest and profit; nor with the Church of Rome, but with the Court of Rome, and wherein it doth consist, namely, in these questions; who shall confer English Bishopricks? who shall convocate English Synods? who shall receive Tenths, and First-fruits, and Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity? Whether the Pope can make binding laws in England, without the consent of the King and Kingdom, or dispense with English Laws at his own pleasure, or call English subjects to Rome without the Prince's leave, or set up Legantine Courts in England against their wills? And this I shew not out of the opinions of particular authors, but out of the public laws of the Kingdom.

I prove, moreover, out of our Fundamental Laws, and the writings of our best Historiographers, that all these branches of Papal power were abuses, and innovations, and usurpations, first attempted to be introduced into England above eleven hundred years after CHRIST, with the names of the innovators, and the precise time when each innovation began, and the opposition that was made against it by our Kings, by our Bishops, by our Peers, by our Parliaments, with the groans of the Kingdom under these Papal innovations and extortions.

Likewise, in point of doctrine, thou hast been instructed that the Catholic Faith doth comprehend all those points which are controverted between us and the Church of Rome, without the express belief whereof no Christian can be saved: whereas, in truth, all these are but opinions, yet some more dangerous than others. If none of them had ever been started in the world there is sufficient to salvation for points to be believed in the Apostles' Creed. Into this Apostolical Faith professed in the Creed, and explicated by the four first General Councils, and only into this faith we have all been baptized. Far be it from

us to imagine, that the Catholic Church hath ever more baptized, and doth still baptize but into one half of the Christian Faith.

In sum, doth thou desire to live in the communion of the true Catholic Church? So do I. But as I dare not change the cognizance of my christianity, that is, my Creed, nor enlarge the Christian Faith (I mean the essentials of it) beyond those bounds which the Apostles have set, so I dare not (to serve the interest of the Roman Court) limit the Catholic Church, which CHRIST hath purchased with his blood, to a fourth or a fifth part of the Christian world.

Thou art for tradition, so am I. But my tradition is not the tradition of one particular Church contradicted by the tradition of another Church, but the universal and perpetual tradition of the Christian world united. Such a tradition is a full proof, which is received *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*; always, everywhere, and by all Christians. Neither do I look upon the opposition of an handful of heretics (they are no more, being compared to the innumerable multitudes of Christians,) in one or two ages, as inconsistent with universality, any more than the highest mountains are inconsistent with the roundness of the earth.

Thou desirest to bear the same respect to the Church of Rome that thy ancestors did; so do I. But for that fulness of power, yea, co-active power in the exterior Court, over the subjects of other Princes, and against their wills, devised by the Court of Rome, not by the Church of Rome; it is that pernicious source from whence all these usurpations did spring. Our ancestors from time to time made laws against it; and our Reformation, in point of Discipline, being rightly understood, was but a pursuing of their steps. The true controversy is, whether the Bishop of Rome ought, by Divine right, to have the external regiment of the English Church, and co-active jurisdiction in English Courts, over English subjects, against the will of the King and the Laws of the Kingdom.—*Works*, p. 289.

*Ibid.*

As for Essentials of Faith, the pillars of the earth are not

founded more firmly than our belief upon that undoubted rule of Vincentius, *Quicquid ubique semper et ab omnibus, &c.* Whatsoever we believe as an Article of our Faith, we have for it the testimony and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and therein the Church of Rome itself. But they have no such perpetual or universal tradition for their twelve new Articles of Pope Pius. This objection would have become me much better than him. Whatsoever we believe, they believe, and all the Christian world of all places, and all ages, doth now believe, and ever did believe, except condemned heretics. But they endeavour to obtrude new essentials of Faith upon the Christian world which have no such perpetual or such universal tradition. He that accuseth another, should have an eye to himself.

Does not all the world see that the Church of England stands now otherwise in order to the Church of Rome, than it did in Henry the Seventh's days? He addeth further, that it is confessed that the Papal power in Ecclesiastical affairs was cast out of England in Henry the Eighth's days. I answer that there was no mutation concerning Faith, nor concerning any legacy which CHRIST left to His Church, nor concerning the power of the Keys, or any jurisdiction purely spiritual, but concerning co-active power in the Exterior Court, concerning the Political or External Regiment of the Church, concerning the Patronage or Civil Sovereignty over the Church of England, and the Legislative, Judiciary, and Dispensative power of the Pope in England, over English subjects, which was no more than a reinfranchisement of ourselves, from the upstart usurpations of the Court of Rome, of all which I have shewed him expressly the first source, who began them, when, and where; before which he is not able to give one instance of any such practices attempted by the Bishop of Rome, and admitted by the Church of England.—*Works*, p. 342.

#### SANDERSON, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

Nor will their flying to tradition help them in this case, or free them from Pharisaism; but rather make the more against them. For to omit that it hath been the usual course of false

teachers, when their doctrines were found not to be Scripture-proof, to fly to tradition : do but inquire a little into the original and growth of Pharisaical traditions, and you shall find that one egg is not more like another, than the Papists and the Pharisees are alike in this matter. When Sadoc (or whosoever else was the first author of the sect of the Sadducees) and his followers began to vent their pestilent and Atheistical doctrines against the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and other like : the best learned among the Jews, (the Pharisees especially) opposed against them by arguments and collections drawn from the Scriptures. The Sadducees finding themselves unable to hold argument with them, (as having two shrewd disadvantages ; but a little learning, and a bad cause ;) had no other means to avoid the force of all their arguments, than to hold them precisely to the letter of the text, without admitting any exposition thereof, or collection therefrom. Unless they could bring clear text, that should affirm *totidem verbis* what they denied, they would not yield. The Pharisees on the contrary refused (as they had good cause) to be tied to such unreasonable conditions ; but stood upon the meaning of the Scriptures, as the Sadducees did upon the letter ; confirming the truth of their interpretations partly from reason, and partly from tradition. Not meaning by tradition (as yet) any doctrine other than what was already sufficiently contained in the Scriptures ; but merely the doctrine which had been in all ages constantly taught and received with an universal consent among the people of God, as consonant to the Holy Scriptures, and grounded thereon. By this means, though they could not satisfy the Sadducees (as Heretics and Sectaries commonly are obstinate), yet so far they satisfied the generality of the people, that they grew into very great esteem with them ; and within a while carried all before them : the detestation of the Sadducees and of their loose errors also conducing not a little thereunto. And who now but the Pharisees : and what now but tradition ? in every man's eye and mouth. Things being at this pass, any wise man may judge, how easy a matter it was for men so revered as the Pharisees were, to abuse the credulity of the people and the

interest they had in their good opinion, to their own advantage : to make themselves lords of the people's faith, and by little and little to bring into the worship whatsoever doctrines and observances they pleased ; and all under the acceptable name of the traditions of the Elders. And so they did, winning continually upon the people by their cunning and shows of religion, and proceeding still more and more, till the Jewish worship by their means was grown to that height of superstition and formality, as we see it was in our SAVIOUR's days. Such was the beginning, and such the rise, of those Pharisaical traditions.

Popish traditions also came in and grew up just after the same manner. The orthodox Bishops and Doctors in the ancient Church, being to maintain the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the Hypostatical union of the two natures in the Person of Christ, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and other like articles of the Catholic Religion against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and other Heretics ; for that the words Trinity, Homousion, Hypostasis, Procession, &c. (which for the better expressing of the Catholic sense they were forced to use), were not expressly to be found in the Holy Scriptures ; had recourse, therefore, very often in their writings against the Heretics of their times, to the tradition of the Church. Whereby they meant not (as the Papists would now wrest their words) any unwritten doctrine not contained in the Scriptures, but the very doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all faithful Christians in the Catholic Church, down from the Apostles' times till the several present ages wherein they lived. This course of theirs, of so serviceable and necessary use in those times, gave the first occasion and after-rise to that heap of errors and superstitions, which in process of time (by the power and policy of the Bishop of Rome especially), were introduced into the Christian Church under the specious name and colour of Catholic traditions. Thus have they trodden in the steps of their forefathers the Pharisees ; and stand guilty even as they of the superstition here condemned by

our SAVIOUR, in teaching for doctrines, men's precepts.—*Ad Clerum*, v. p. 85.

COSIN, BISHOP—*Preface to his Notes on the Common Prayer.*

In truth we have continued the old religion; and the ceremonies which we have taken from them that were before us, are not things which belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them, which our fathers before us had, from whom the same descended to us. To abrogate those things without constraint of apparent harm thence arising, had been to alter unjustly the universal practice of the people of God, and those general decrees of the Fathers, which (in St. Augustin's language) is madness and insolence to do, both in respect of the universal authority of the Church, which no particular Church has power to controul, and also in regard of reasons before mentioned.—p. 50. (*in Nicholls' Commentary.*)

*Ibid.*—*Judgment betwixt the Church of England and Church of Rome.*

If the Roman Catholics would make the essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in the following points, we are at accord with them: in the reception and belief of . . . . .the unanimous and general consent of the ancient Catholic Fathers, and the Universal Church of CHRIST in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and the collection of all necessary matters of faith from them, during the first six centuries downwards to our own day<sup>1</sup>.

HAMMOND, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR. — *Of Heresy.*

1. This then being the adequate object of the Christian's Faith, those verities which have been revealed to us by God to be thus believed to righteousness, called therefore *ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι*, words

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bp. Hickes's Letters, vol. i. Ap. paper iv.

not only true but wholesome, the belief whereof is required in order to our souls' health; the next enquiry is, how we that live in the same distance from CHRIST and His Apostles in respect of time, that we are situate from heaven, which now contains CHRIST, in respect of place, may come within the reach of these revelations of CHRIST, or to any competent undoubted assurance, that those are such indeed, which are pretended to be so.

2. And to this also my concession shall be as liberal as any Romanist can wish, that there are *two* ways of conveying such revelations to us; one in writing, the other by oral tradition; the former in the Gospels and other writings of the Apostles, &c. which makes up the Sacred Writ, or Canon of the New Testament; the latter in the Apostles' preaching to all the Churches of their plantations, which are nowhere set down for us in the Sacred Writ, but conserved as *deposita* by them to whom they were entrusted.

3. And although in sundry respects the former of these be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands, thus much being on these grounds confest by Bellarmine himself, that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief; yet there being no less veracity in the tongues, than the hands, in the preachings, than the writings of the Apostles; nay, *Prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus*, saith Tertullian, the Apostles preacht before they writ, planted Churches before they addrest Epistles to them: on these grounds I make no scruple to grant, that Apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as Apostolical writings, are equally the matter of a Christian's belief; who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is Apostolical writing, so the other is Apostolical tradition.

§ IV. 1. Next then the enquiry must proceed by examining what is this equal way of conveyance, common to both these, upon strength of which we become obliged to receive such or such a tradition for Apostolical.

2. And this again is acknowledged not to be any Divine testimony; for God hath nowhere affirmed in Divine Writ, that the

Epistle, inscribed of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, consisting of so many periods as now it is in our Bibles, was ever written by that Apostle, nor are there any inward characters or signatures, or beams of light in the writing itself, that can be admitted, or pretended for testimonies of this, any more than the like may exact to be admitted as witnesses, that the Creed called the Apostles, was indeed in the full sense of it, delivered to the Churches.

3. It remains then, that herein on both sides we rest content with human testimonies of undoubted authority, or such as there is not any rational motive to distrust, and of which alone the matter is capable. For as in case of question concerning the Epistle to the Romans, whether this be it, which was addressd by St. Paul to that Church, the only regular way of satisfying the question, is, 1st, By devolution or appeal to the authority of those Fathers and Councils, to whom it was *de facto* sufficiently testified and approved, (viz. by examination of the records of that Church to whom it was written, and by whom received, through the hands of some trusty messenger of that Apostle, such as Phœbe that ministered unto him, and by other creditable ways of confirmation) and 2ndly, and by that consequence, to those very original records and proofs of undoubted fidelity: so the way of trial of any tradition, pretended to be Apostolical, whether it be such or no, is by devolving it to those same, or the like Fathers and Councils, which having occasion and commodity to examine the truth of the matter by the records or testimonies of those Churches, to which it was delivered, found it sufficiently testified by them, that it was in truth according as is pretended.

4. And from hence it follows, that as we of this age have no other way of judging of the Canon of Scripture, or of any book, or chapter, or period contained in it, but by the affirmation and authority of those testifiers in the first ages of the Church, either by their writings, or by the unquestioned relations of others, brought down and made known to us; so are we as unable to judge of Apostolical traditions unwritten, whether this or that doctrine be such or no, unless it be thus by the

undoubted affirmations of the ancients (who are presumable by their antiquity to know the truth, and by their uniform consent, neither to mistake themselves, nor to deceive us ;) communicated and conveyed to us.

5. 'Tis not possible for any man or men of the greatest understandings or integrity, to see or know what is not done within the reach of their faculties, unless either they be inspired by God, or otherwise informed either mediately or immediately from those, who had really knowledge of it. Stories of former times are not wont to be written by the strength of men's natural parts, invention, or judgment, but only by consulting of those records, either dead or living, by whose help such matters of fact have been preserved. Every thing else is but conjecture, and that very uncertain, the utmost probability in such matters being little worth, that being oftentimes done which really was (and much more to us, who know not the motives of actions far removed from us, is) of all things least probable to have been done. Only a creditable witness, such as no prudent man hath reason to distrust either as nescient or false, is worth considering, or able to found belief in this matter.

§ V. 1. Now then comes the upshot of the inquiry, what qualifications there are of a testimony or testifier, without which, it or he may not be thus deemed creditable, *οὐκ ἀξιόπιστος* worthy to be believed by a sober Christian; and where these qualifications are to be found, which when we have once resolved, it will also be possible for us to pass some judgment of traditions duly styled Apostolical, which as such must be allowed to be the object of our Faith.

2. And herein I shall hope also that the resolution will be unquestionable, if it be bounded by those three terms, to which Vincentius Lirinensis in his defence of the Catholic Faith against Heresies and innovations hath directed us, *Universitas, Antiquitas, Consensio*, Universality, Antiquity, Consent, viz. That the testimony we depend on, be the result of all, the ancients, consenting, or without any considerable dissent. Or, in yet fewer

words, a Catholic testimony, truly such, *i. e.* universal in all respects; (1) of place, (2) of time, (3) of persons.

3. For first, if it be not testified from all places, it is not qualified for our belief, as Catholic in respect of place, because the Faith being one and the same, and by all and every of the Apostles preached, and deposited in all their plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by any of them in any Church, will also be found to have been taught, and received in all other Apostolical Churches.

4. To which purpose the words of Irenæus are express, lib. i. cap. 3. The Church disseminated over all the world, having received this preaching and this Faith, preserves it diligently, as the inhabitants of the same house, believe them alike, as having the same soul and heart, and teach, and preach, and deliver them alike, as having the same mouth, for though their languages are unlike, the virtue of tradition is one and the same, and neither do the Churches which are found in Germany believe or deliver otherwise than those which were constituted in Spain, in France, in the Orient, in Egypt, in Africk, in the middle of the world, but as one and the same sun shines through the whole world, so doth the light and preaching of the truth in every place, where it is received, disperse itself.

5. So also Tertullian de Præscript. c. 20. Presently, therefore, the Apostles having first in Judea testified the Faith and instituted Churches, and then taken them over all the world, made known to the nations the same doctrine of the same Faith, and so planted Churches in every city, from which the rest of the Churches afterward borrowed their seeds of Faith and doctrine, and so daily continue to do and are formed into Churches.

6. From which premises his conclusion is just that which I here deduce; if so, then it is evident that every doctrine must be deemed true which conspires with the Apostolical Churches, which are the wombs and originals whence the Faith came out, as maintaining that without any question, which the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from CHRIST, and

CHRIST from GOD ; and that all other doctrine is under the prejudice of being false, which is contrary to the truth of the Churches of the Apostles, of CHRIST, and of GOD.

7. It is true, indeed, that whatsoever one Church professeth to have received from the Apostle that planted it, is of itself sufficient, without the confirmation of all others, to beget and establish belief in him, to whom it thus testifies : whereupon Tertullian refers the inquirer to that Apostolic Church which is next to him, be it Corinth, if he live in Achaia, Philippi, or Thessalonica, if in Macedonia, Ephesus, if in Asia, or if he be near Italy, Rome. But this is no farther to be extended, than while we suppose without inquiry, that other Apostolical Churches have received, and are ready to testify the same ; which presumption or supposal must then cease, when upon inquiry we find the contrary ; there being then none of this first kind of universality ; viz. of place, and so far, no validity in the testification.

8. Secondly, for the universality of time, that must be cautiously understood ; not so as to signify it a prejudice to any doctrine, if in some one or more ages it have not been universally received ; for then there could be no Heretics at any time in the world : but so as to extend to the first and purest, and not only to the latter ages of the Church.

9. That which was delivered by the Apostles was certainly received in that first age, wherein they lived ; and by careful inquiry will be found from their monuments to have been among them. And that which by this trial is discerned to be of latter date, not to be descried in the first times, nor testified by sufficient authority to be derived from thence, falls short again of this second part of universality in respect of time.

10. Thirdly, for the consent of testifiers, that is also necessary to the rendering it a Catholic and authentic testimony ; any considerable number of dissenters being of necessity to weaken our belief, and infuse reasons of doubting, and a preponderancy of dissenters the other way, to weigh down (at least to incline) the belief to the contrary.

§ VI. 1. This, therefore, being thus established, and the

conjunction of all the three sorts of universality being in all reason required to the authentic testifying of tradition, it is soon defined, where these qualifications are to be looked for, and where they may be found.

2. Questionless not in any one Bishop, or succession of Bishops in any See for many latter ages, not including the Apostles; for whatever his pretensions may be to authority and supremacy over all other Churches, this can never convert a particular whether man or Church, into the universal, nor make his testimony authentic according to those rational and Christian rules, which we have learned from Lirinensis.

3. There are many Apostolic Churches beside that of Rome: great difference of Rome in these latter ages from the Primitive Apostolic Rome, to which the depositum was intrusted. And there are many dissenters to be found, who have always lived and flourished in the Catholic Church, which never acknowledged those doctrines to be delivered to them by the Apostles, which the Church of Rome hath of late assumed to be such. And for any privilege annexed to that Bishop's chair, or to that society of men, which live in external communion with him, that he or they can never define any thing to be (*de fide*) part of the Faith, which is not so, as that is, beyond all other their pretensions, most denied by us, and least attempted to be proved by the Romanist, and not so much as consented on among themselves; so must it in no reason be supposed in this dispute, or taken for granted by them, but is rejected with the same ease that it is mentioned by them.

4. As for other pretenders, I know not any, save only that of the universal consent of the Doctors of the first ages, or that of an universal Council. And both these we are willing to admit with such cautions only as the matter exacts, and the grounds of defining already laid.

5. The universal consent of the Doctors of the first ages, bearing testimony that such or such a doctrine was from the Apostles' preachings delivered to all Churches by them planted, or their general conform testimony herein, without any considerable dissenters producible, is, I acknowledge, authentic or

worthy of belief, and so hath been made use of by the orthodox of all times, as sufficient for the rejecting of any new doctrine.

6. So likewise is the declaration of a general Council, free, and gathered from all quarters, and in such other respects, truly so called, founded in the examination of the monuments of the several Apostolical plantations, either produced in Council, or authentically confirmed from the letters of the several Churches, either formerly prepared in provincial and national Councils, or otherwise sufficiently confirmed to them, and this declaration conciliarly promulgated, and after the promulgation universally received and accepted by the Church diffusive; or else it is evident all this while, that it is not a Catholic (truly so styled) testimony.

7. For that any Council of Bishops, the most numerous that ever was in the world (much less a but major part of those few, that be there present) is not yet really the universality of Christians, is too evident to be doubted of.

8. It can only then be pretended, that it is the universal representative, or such an assembly, wherein is contained the virtue and influences of the whole universal Church. And thus, indeed, I suppose it to be, as often as the doctrines there established by universal consent (founded in Scripture and tradition) have either been before discussed and resolved in each provincial Council, which have sent their delegates thither from all the parts of the world, or else have *post factum*, after the promulgation, been accepted by them, and acknowledged to agree with that Faith which they had originally received.—*Works*, vol. i. p. 545.

#### II.—*Practical Catechism.*

But what if the particular Church wherein I was baptized, shall fall from its own steadfastness, and by authority or law set up that, which if it be not contrary to plain words of Scripture, is yet contrary to the doctrine or practice of the universal Church of the first and purest times; what will meekness require me to do in that case? Meekness will require me to be very wary in passing such judgment on that Church; but if the

light be so clear and the defection be so palpably discernible to all, that I cannot but see and acknowledge it, and in case it be true, that I am actually convinced, that the particular Church in which I live, is departed from the Catholic Apostolic Church; then it being certain that the greater authority must be preferred before the lesser, and that next the Scripture the Catholic Church of the first and purest times, (especially when the subsequent ages do also accord with that for many hundreds of years) is the greatest authority, it follows that meekness requires my obedience and submission to the Catholic Apostolic Church, and not to the particular wherein I live: so far I mean, as that I am to retain that Catholic Apostolic, and not this novel, corrupt, not Catholic doctrine. And if for my doing so I fall under persecution of the rulers of that particular Church, meekness then requires me patiently to endure it, but in no case to subscribe to or act anything which is contrary to this Catholic doctrine.—Some other obligations there are upon every Christian (wherein meekness interposeth not) which do require me not to depart from any Catholic Apostolic truth or practice, at least not to submit to (or act) the contrary, or to do anything which is apt to confirm others in so doing, or to lead those that doubt (by my example) to do what they doubt to be unlawful. For in all these particulars, the Christian law of scandal obliges me, not only not to yield to any schism from the Catholic Apostolic Church, or other the like corruption, but not to do those things by which I shall be thought by prudent men to do so.—Meekness permits me also to seek out for some purer Church, if that may conveniently be had for me. Nay, if I am by my calling fitted for it, and can prudently hope to plant (or contribute to the planting) such a pure Apostolic Church where there is none, or to reconcile and restore peace between divided members of the Church Catholic, my endeavour to do so is in this case extremely commendable, and that which God's providence seems to direct me to, by what is thus befallen me. . . . The authority by which it stands in the whole Church, is that of the practice of the primitive universal Christian Church; not that we have any certain evidence of the time of its beginning, but

that the immemorial observation of it is an argument of the primitive, if not Apostolic institution of it.—Lib. ii. § 1. & 12.

*Ibid.*

The practice and writings of the ancient Church, which is the best way to explicate any such difficulty in Scripture, is a clear testimony and proof, that both the bread and the wine belong to all the people, in the name of his Disciples at that time. But why may it not be said, that laymen may baptize also, and do those other things, for which CHRIST gave power to His Disciples, as well as this bread and wine, divided among the Disciples, should belong to them? The answer is given already, that the Apostolical practice and the universal consent of the ancient primitive Church have defined the one, and defined against the other, and that ought to satisfy any sober man's scruples; it being no way probable that CHRIST's institution would be presently frustrated and corrupted by His own Apostles, or their practice so falsified by the universal agreement of all that lived next after them, especially there being no universal Council, wherein it were possible for them all uniformly to agree on such an opposition.—Lib. vi. § 4.

THORNDIKE, PRESBYTER.—*Of the Principles of Christian Truth.*

Whatsoever then is said of the rule of Faith in the writings of the Fathers, is to be understood of the creed; whereof, though it be not maintained, that the words which pretenders were required to render by heart were the same, yet the substance of it, and the reasons and grounds which make every point necessary to be believed, were always the same in all Churches, and remain unchangeable. I would not have any hereupon to think, that the matter of this rule is not, in my conceit, contained in the Scriptures. For I find St. Cyril (Catech. v.) protesting, that it contains nothing but that which concerned our salvation the most, selected out of the Scriptures. And, therefore in other places, he tenders his scholars evidence out of the Scriptures, and wishes them not to believe that whereof there is no such evidence. And

to the same effect, (Eucherius in Symb. Hom. 1. Paschasius de Sp. S. in Præf., and after them Thomas Aquinas secunda ii. Quest. 1. Art. ix.) all agree that the form of the Creed was made up out of the Scriptures ; giving such reasons as no reasonable Christian can refuse. Not only because all they whose salvation is concerned have not leisure to study the Scriptures, but because they that have, cannot easily or safely discern, wherein the substance of faith, upon the profession whereof our salvation depends, consisteth ; supposing that they were able to discern between true and false, in the meaning of the Scriptures. To which I will add only that which Tertullian and others of the Fathers observe of the ancient Heretics, that their fashion was to take occasion, upon one or two texts, to overthrow and deny the main substance and scope of the whole Scriptures ; which, whether it be seen in the sects of our time, or not, I will not say here, (because I will not take any thing for granted which I have not yet principles to prove) but supposing it only a thing possible, I will think I give a sufficient reason why God should provide tradition as well as Scripture, to bound the sense of it ; as St. Cyril also cautioneth in the place aforementioned, where he so liberally acknowledgeth the Creed to be taken out of the Scripture. For (saith he) “ the Faith was not framed as it pleased men, but the most substantial matters collected out of the Scripture do make up one doctrine of the Faith.” For, I beseech you, what had they, whosoever they were that first framed the Creed, but Tradition, whereby to distinguish that which is substantial from that which is not ? Hear Origen in the Preface to his books *περὶ ἀρχῶν*. “ There being many that think their sense to be Christian, and yet the sense of some differs from their predecessors ; but that, which the Church preaches, as delivered by order of succession from the Apostles, being preserved and remaining the same in the Churches ; that only is to be believed for truth, which nothing differs from the Tradition of the Church. This, notwithstanding, we must know ; that the Holy Apostles, preaching the Faith of CHRIST, delivered some things, (as many as they held necessary) most manifestly to all believers, even those whom they found the duller in the search of Divine knowledge ; leaving the reason why they affirmed them

to the search of those that got to receive the eminent gifts of the Holy Ghost, especially of utterance, wisdom, and knowledge, by the Holy Ghost. Of other things they said that they are, but how, or whereupon they are, they said not. Forsooth, that the more studious of their successors, loving wisdom and knowledge, might have some exercise wherein to show the fruit of their wit; to wit, those that should prepare themselves to be worthy and capable of wisdom. Now, the particulars of that which is manifestly delivered by the preaching of the Apostles are these, which he proceedeth to set down. But Vincentius Lirinensis hath writ a Discourse on purpose to show that this rule of Faith, being delivered by succession to the principal, as St. Paul requires Timothy to do, and by them to those that were baptized, was the ground upon which all heresies, attempting upon the Faith, were condemned. So that, so many heresies, as historical truth will evidence, to have been excluded the Church from the Apostle's time, for matter of belief, so many convictions of this rule; which, because all agreed that they transgressed, therefore they were excluded the Church. But Vincentius, besides this, advanceth another mark to discern what belongs to the Rule, that is, what the ground and scope of our Creed requires. For it might be said, that perhaps something may come in question whether consistent with the rule of Faith or not, in which there hath passed no decree of the Primitive Church, because never questioned by that time: wherein, therefore, we shall be to seek, notwithstanding the decrees past by the Church upon ancient heresies. Which to meet with, Vincentius saith further, that whatsoever hath been unanimously taught in the Church by writing, that is, always, by all, everywhere, to that, no contradiction is ever to be admitted in the Church. Here the style changes; for whereas Irenæus, Tertullian, and others of former time, appeal only to that which was visible in the practice of all Churches: by the time of the Council at Ephesus, (the date of Vincentius's book) so much had been written upon all points of Faith, and upon the Scriptures, that he presumeth, evidence may be made of it all, what may stand with that which the whole Church had taught, what may not. p. 44.

ID.—*Just weights and measures.*

It is not the decree of the present Church, but the witness and agreement of the whole Church, that renders any thing infallible.—Seeing, therefore, that the malice of man, by dividing the Church, rendereth it invisible, as hard to be seen, though not invisible, as not possible to be seen, what remaineth, but that all public persons, and whosoever is interested in the divisions of the Church, understand and consider what account they owe, for the souls that must needs miscarry by the divisions which they maintain, when they need not? For how shall he be clear, that professes not a desire of condescending to all that which truth will allow on either side, for the advantage of peace on both sides? And seeing neither side can make peace without the consent of both, but either may have truth alone; what remaineth, but that all reformation be confined within those bounds, which the faith and the law of the Catholic Church fixeth?—The true sense of the Scripture is not to be had, but out of the records of antiquity; especially of God's ancient people first, and then of the Christian Church. The obligation of that sense upon the Church at this time, is not to be measured against the Primitive practice of the whole Church. The reformation of the Church is nothing but the restoring of that which may appear to have been in force.—It is, therefore, necessary, that both sides professing the Reformation, should agree upon the true ground of Reformation; and so upon the rule which that ground will maintain and evidence; that is, to submit all that is in question to the visible practice of the primitive times, before those abuses were brought in, which the reformation pretendeth to restore.—There is the same ground to believe—that there is, for the common Christianity, namely, the Scriptures interpreted by the perpetual practice of God's Church.—And seeing the abating of the first form under Edward VI. hath wrought no effect, but to give them that desired it an appetite to root up the whole; what thanks can we render to God for escaping so great a danger, but by sticking firm to a rule that will stick firm to us, and carry us

through any dispute in religion, and land us in the haven of a quiet conscience, what troubles soever we may pass through, in maintaining that the Reformation of the Church will never be according to the rule which it ought to follow, till it cleave to the Catholic Church of CHRIST in this particular? p. 50, 51. 98. 159.

*Ibid.*—*The due way of composing the Differences on foot, preserving the Church.*

The chief ground that I suppose here, because I have proved it at large, is the meaning of that Article of our Creed, which professeth one Catholic Church. For either it signifies nothing, or it signifies that God hath founded one visible Church, that is, that he hath obliged all churches (and all Christians of whom all churches consist) to hold visible communion with the whole Church in the visible offices of God's public service. And therefore I am satisfied, that the differences upon which we are divided, cannot be justly settled upon any terms, which any part of the whole Church shall have just cause to refuse, as inconsistent with the unity of the whole Church. For in that case we must needs become schismatics, by settling ourselves upon such laws, under which any Church may refuse to communicate with us, because it is bound to communicate with the whole Church. p. 225.

TAYLOR, BISHOP.—*Dissuasive from Popery.*

It was the challenge of St. Austin to the Donatists, who (as the Church of Rome does at this day) enclosed the Catholic Church within their own circuits: "Ye say that CHRIST is heir of no lands, but where Donatus is co-heir. Read this to us out of the law and the Prophets, out of the Psalms, out of the Gospel itself, or out of the letters of the Apostles: read it thence, and we believe it:"—plainly directing us to the fountains of our faith, the Old and New Testament, the words of Christ, and the words of the Apostles. For nothing else can be the fountain of our faith: whatsoever came in after these, "*foris est*," it belongs not unto Christ.

To these we also add, not as authors or finishers, but as helpers of our faith, and heirs of the doctrine apostolical, the sentiments

and catholic doctrine of the Church of God, in the ages next after the Apostles. Not that we think them or ourselves bound to every private opinion, even of a primitive bishop and martyr ; but that we all acknowledge that the whole church of God kept the faith entire, and transmitted faithfully to the after-ages the whole faith, *τύπον διδαχῆς* “ the form of doctrine, and sound words, which was at first delivered to the saints,” and was defective in nothing that belonged unto salvation ; and we believe that those ages sent millions of saints to the bosom of CHRIST, and sealed the true faith with their lives and with their deaths, and by both gave testimony unto JESUS, and had from him the testimony of his Spirit.

And this method of procedure we now choose, not only because to them that know well how to use it, to the sober and moderate, the peaceable and the wise, it is the best, the most certain, visible and tangible, most humble and satisfactory : but also because the Church of Rome does, with greatest noises, pretend her conformity to antiquity. Indeed the present Roman doctrines, which are in difference, were invisible and unheard of in the first and best antiquity, and with how ill success their quotations are out of the fathers of the three first ages, every inquiring man may easily discern. But the noises, therefore, which they make, are from the writings of the succeeding ages ; where secular interest did more prevail, and the writings of the fathers were vast and voluminous, full of controversy and ambiguous senses, fitted to their own times and questions, full of proper opinions, and such variety of sayings, that both sides, eternally and inconfutably, shall bring sayings for themselves respectively. Now although things being thus, it will be impossible for them to conclude from the sayings of a number of fathers, that their doctrine, which they would prove thence, was the catholic doctrine of the church ; because any number that is less than all, does not prove a catholic consent ; yet the clear sayings of one or two of these fathers, truly alleged by us to the contrary, will certainly prove that what many of them (suppose it) do affirm, and which but two or three as good Catholics as the other do deny, was not then matter of faith, or a doctrine of the church ; for if it had, these had been accounted heretics, and not have remained

in the communion of the church. But although for the reasonableness of the thing, we have thought fit to take notice of it : yet we shall have no need to make use of it, since, not only in the prime and purest antiquity, we are indubitably more than conquerors, but even in the succeeding ages, we have the advantage both ‘*numero, pondere, et mensura,*’ in number, weight, and measure.

We do easily acknowledge, that to dispute these questions from the sayings of the fathers, is not the readiest way to make an end of them ; but, therefore, we do wholly rely upon Scriptures, as the foundation and final resort of all our persuasions, and from thence can never be confuted ; but we also admit the fathers as admirable helps for the understanding of the Scriptures, and as good testimony of the doctrine delivered from their forefathers down to them, of what the church esteemed the way of salvation : and therefore, if we find any doctrine now taught, which was not placed in their way of salvation, we reject it as being no part of the Christian faith, and which ought not to be imposed upon consciences. They were ‘wise unto salvation’ and ‘fully instructed to every good work ;’ and therefore, the faith, which they professed and derived from Scripture, we profess also ; and in the same faith, we hope to be saved even as they. But for the new doctors, we understand them not, we know them not ; our faith is the same from the beginning, and cannot become new.

But because we shall make it to appear, that they do greatly innovate in all their points of controversy with us, and show nothing but shadows instead of substances, and little images of things instead of solid arguments ; we shall take from them their armour in which they trusted, and choose this sword of Goliath to combat their errors ; for *non est alter talis* ; it is not easy to find a better than the word of God, expounded by the prime and best antiquity.—Part i. book i. § i. *Works*, vol. x. p. 129.

#### HEYLIN, PRESBYTER.

Things that have been generally in the Church of Christ are generally conceived to have been derived from apostolical tradi-

tion, without any special mandate left in Scripture for the doing of them. Praying directly towards the East is conceived to be of that condition; why may we not conclude the like of setting up the altar along the wall? Many things come into our minds by a successional tradition, for which we cannot find an express command, which yet we ought to entertain, *ex vi Catholicæ consuetudinis*; of which traditions there are many, which still retain their force among us in England. This Church (the Lord be thanked for it) hath stood more firm for apostolical traditions, than any other whatsoever of the Reformation.—Antid. Lincoln, p. 87<sup>1</sup>.

COMMISSIONERS OF A. D. 1662.—*Appointed to review the Book of Common Prayer.*

Ancient Liturgies in the Church, St. Chrysostom's, St. Basil's, St. James's, and others, and such things as are found in them all consistent with Catholic and Primitive doctrine, may well be presumed to have been from the first, especially since we find no original of these Liturgies from General Councils.—*Reply to Presbyterians*, § 16.

PEARSON, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*On the Creed.*

As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that 'faith which was once delivered to the saints,' and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason; not urging the authority of the Church which they reject, but only giving in the margin the sense of the primi-

<sup>1</sup> As extracted in "the Canterburians' self-conviction," 1640. p. 63.

tive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.—*Preface.*

#### BARROW, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.

It can indeed no wise be safe to follow any such leaders (whatever pretences to special illumination they hold forth, whatever specious guises of sanctity they bear) who in their doctrine or practice deflect from the great beaten roads of holy Scripture, primitive tradition, and Catholic practice, roving in by-paths suggested to them by their private fancies and humours, their passions and lusts, their interests and advantages: there have in all ages such counterfeit guides started up, having debauched some few heedless persons, having erected some *παρασυρωγίαι* or petty combinations against the regularly settled corporations; but never with any durable success or countenance of Divine Providence; but like prodigious meteors, having caused a little *gazing*, and some disturbance, their sects have soon been dissipated, and have quite vanished away: the authors and abettors of them being either buried in oblivion, or recorded with ignominy: like that Theudas in the speech of Gamaliel, who “rose up boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men about four hundred joined themselves; who were slain, and all as many as obeyed him were scattered and brought to nought.”—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 206.

#### BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Apol. pro Harm.* i. 6.

GOD knows the secrets of my heart; so far am I from the itch of originality in Theological Doctrines, . . . that whatever are sanctioned by the consent of Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops, though my own small ability attain not to them, yet I will embrace them with all reverence. In truth I had already learned by no few experiments, in writing my *Harmony* while yet a young man, what now in my mature age I am most thoroughly persuaded of, that no one can contradict Catholic

consent, however he may seem to be countenanced for a while by some passages of Scripture wrongly understood and by the illusions of unreal arguments, without being found in the end to have contradicted both Scripture and sound reason. I daily deplore and sigh over the unbridled license of prophesying which obtained for some years in this our England, . . . under the tyranny of what some considered a wretched necessity. In a word, my hearty desire is this, Let the ancient customs, doctrines remain in force<sup>1</sup>.

STILLINGTON, BISHOP.—*Grounds of Protestant Religion.*

The Church of England doth very piously declare her consent with the ancient Catholic Church, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholic Church in the four first ages. Not as though the sense of the Catholic Church were pretended to be any infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith; but that it is a sufficient prescription against anything which can be alleged out of Scripture, that if it appear contrary to the sense of the Catholic Church from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture. All this security is built upon this strong presumption, that nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of Faith should be held by the Catholic Church, whose very being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to salvation. As long therefore as the Church might appear to be truly Catholic by those correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one, was so by all; so long this unanimous and uncontradicted sense of the Catholic Church ought to have a great sway upon the minds of such who yet profess themselves members of the Catholic Church. From whence it follows, that such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the Catholic Church within that

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Nicæn. Can.

time. And thus much may suffice for the first enquiry, viz. What things are to be esteemed necessary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Ecclesiastical Communion. p. 55.

#### KENN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

As for my religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I die in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan Innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross.—*His last Will.*

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP.—Preface to *Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus.*

To such a degree of temerity has this our senseless age advanced, that there is scarcely any thing in Christianity itself which is not either called into doubt in private, or made matter of controversy in public. So much so, that even those doctrines and rites which, during many ages back, and from the very beginnings of the Church, have every where been received, at last in these our days come into hazard, and are assailed, just as if we were the first Christians, and all our ancestors had assumed and borne the mere name of Christ, and nothing more; or at least, as if all had been constantly involved in the gravest errors, whoever before this time embraced the faith made known in the Gospel. Forsooth in these full late times, it seems new lights are boasted of, new and greater gifts of the Holy Spirit are pretended, and therefore new forms of believing, new forms of praying, new forms of preaching, new forms in the use of ecclesiastical administrations, are daily framed and commonly adopted. And, what is most absurd, nothing now is esteemed of before novelty itself, but the newer any thing is, so much the greater number and the more does it please, and the more anxiously is it defended. Hence these tears, hence so many horrible schisms in the Church!

For whilst individuals, indulging, beyond what is meet, their abilities, or rather their own wanton fancies, devote themselves to the introduction of novelties into religion, the whole body, through the infinite diversity of opinions, comes to be rent into contrary schools and factions.

But if we will only even now recollect ourselves, and weigh things with that temperate and fair spirit which is right, it will at once be clear that we, who now inhabit this and other countries around, are not either the first or the only worshippers of Christ, but only a small part of that great body whose head is Christ : inasmuch as that body, by the exceeding mercy of God, hath been spread abroad into all parts of the earth, and that, from the very times of the Apostles ; so that there is no age, and scarcely any country, in which there have not been very many who, by the faith which we profess, have attained unto heaven. According to this view, if we attentively survey this vast body of all Christians of every age, which is commonly called the *Catholic or Universal Church*, as constituted every where and always, we shall find in it certain, fixed, and, as it were, common principles, which run through the whole, and connect all its parts both with each other and with the head. The first of these, and that from which the rest arise, is, *that Holy Scripture, or the Old and New Testament, is divinely inspired*. In this all Christians every where agree, and have always agreed ; and therefore he who denies it, is pronounced unworthy of their fellowship and of their name. Still further, this holy Scripture, although in these precepts, which are absolutely necessary for every man's salvation, it be most clear and evident to all, yet, as to what respects doctrine and external discipline of the Church, it is not, from its very depth, received by all in one and the same sense, but " the divine sayings of this same Scripture are by one man interpreted in one way, and by another in another ; so that it would seem to admit almost as many meanings as there are men," as formerly *Vincent of Lirin*s observed, and as is more than sufficiently proved from the case of heretics and schismatics, inasmuch as, among them, every individual elicits his own erroneous opinions and practices out of the holy Scriptures interpreted after his own manner. In

things therefore of this nature, if we would be secured from error and falling, first of all, beyond all doubt, we must beware that we do not over pertinaciously adhere to the private opinions and conjectures of ourselves and others, but do rather carefully examine, what the ancient Church, or, at least, the great majority of Christians, have held in these matters, and must acquiesce in that decision which has obtained the consent of Christians in all ages. For as, according to Cicero, on every subject, “the consent of all men is the voice of nature,” so also in things of this sort, the consent of all Christians may be deservedly accounted the voice of the Gospel. But there are many things which, although they are not read in express and definite terms in the holy Scriptures, are yet by the common consent of all Christians drawn out of these Scriptures. For example; “that there are in the ever-blessed Trinity three distinct Persons to be worshipped, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these are, each of them, truly God, and yet that there is but one God: that Christ is God and man, θεάνθρωπος, truly God and truly man, in one and the same person.” These and such like, although they are not, either in the Old or New Testament, declared in so many words and syllables, yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed on by all Christians, certain few heretics only excepted, of whom no more account is to be had in religion, than of monsters in nature. So also, “that infants are to receive the ablution of holy Baptism, and that sponsors are to be used for that Sacrament. That the Lord’s day, or the first day in every seven, is to be religiously observed as a festival. That our Lord’s passion, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, as also the coming of the Holy Ghost, are to be commemorated every year. That the Church is every where to be administered by Bishops, distinguished from Presbyters, and set over them.” These and others of this sort are no where in the sacred Scriptures enjoined directly and by name, yet have they notwithstanding, during fourteen hundred years from the Apostles, been every where received into public use of the Church; nor can there be found any Church during that period not agreeing to these things. So that there have been, as it were, certain

*common notions* from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians, not so much from any particular passages of holy Scripture, as from all ; from the general scope and tenor of the whole Gospel ; from the very nature and purpose of the religion therein established ; and, finally, from the constant tradition of the Apostles, who, together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical rites of this sort, and, if I may so speak, general interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other supposition it would be incredible, or even impossible, that they should have been received with so unanimous a consent every where, always, and by all.

3. From these premises, it is clear at the first glance what will follow. For seeing that no one doubts but that more confidence is to be placed in the whole body than in individual Christians, and more in the Universal Church than in any particular Churches whatsoever : seeing also that there are very many points in which the Universal Church, during many ages after the Apostles, agreed : seeing, finally, that this consent of the Universal Church is the surest interpretation of holy Scripture on those points on which it may be had : it hence most clearly follows, of what and how great use the ancient Fathers, and other writers of all ages of the Church, must be, and how necessary to be consulted by them, who, in the prosecution of ecclesiastical controversies, have at heart either their own salvation, or the peace of the Church. For, were there no commentaries of the ancient Church, no acts of councils, no monuments of ecclesiastical history, extant at this day, in how great darkness should we be involved respecting our very religion itself? How easy would it be for any subtle heretic, or even for any the most flagitious impostor, under the mask of piety, to deceive the generality, and to lead them into the most pernicious errors of every description? Who could then convict the Church of Rome, or any other even the most corrupt communion, of fault or error, in those particulars which are not expressly prohibited in holy Scripture? For whence could it be proved, whether those things which are in use in that Church had, or had not, been handed down from the very Apostles, and approved by the consent of

the Universal Church? Finally, how many and how great disadvantages of every kind would arise hence? But there is no reason that we should occupy our time in the enumeration of these things, seeing that amidst so many and so great confusions of empires, convulsions of particular Churches, and perturbation of all human affairs, it hath been so ordered by the most wise and merciful providence of Almighty God, that from the very times of the Apostles even unto these our own times, there is no age whose ecclesiastical memorials are not preserved to us. From which memorials accordingly we are enabled to conceive a perfect idea of the Universal Church, and to feel assured and certain, what has through all ages been admitted and what rejected; what rites and doctrines have prevailed, what heresies and schisms have been disapproved and condemned. Finally, from these and these alone we may see, on what points of doctrine and discipline agreement hath ever prevailed among all Churches, and on what again controversy hath existed between them, and consequently what is more, and what less, necessary to be believed and observed. For whatever is to be said of other things, those things at any rate in which all Churches every where have agreed, cannot but be most certain, and necessary, even at this very time, to be retained of all.

4. This consent however, be it remembered, of which we are speaking, of the Universal Church, on any articles of Faith or ecclesiastical rites, is not to be sought from one or two writers, much less from any one or two passages in any particular writer, apart from the rest, but from all combined, or at least from the greatest part of those, who, in all ages of the Church, (and especially the earlier) were the authors of any written works, in which they treated on these subjects. For in all societies, such as is the Church, the majority takes place of the minority, and has the same right as the whole. The words of the civil law are, "What is done by the majority of the court, is accounted the same as if done by all." Nay, this is one of the ordinary rules of that law. "That is ascribed to the whole, which is publicly done by the majority." That therefore which is by the majority either appointed or affirmed, that is rightly to be con-

sidered the act of the Universal Church ; much more that which is confirmed by the united testimonies of all, or nearly all. To which class very many things in ecclesiastical matters may easily be reduced. For although we have not the express opinions of every individual Christian, through all ages, handed down to us, yet we possess what is to the same effect. For, first, when we speak of the consent of the Universal Church, it is not necessary that we regard the opinions of the people also, or laity. For they have never been admitted to deliver their judgment on the doctrine or discipline of the Church, in that it was presumed that in all things they, as is right, followed, not led, the opinions of their pastors. And besides, seeing that the people were anciently wont to vote in the election of their own bishops, and to give their testimony concerning those to be elected ; by that very act they shewed openly enough that they agreed to their doctrine and discipline ; so that whatever might be the opinion of any one bishop, the people over whom he presided might fairly be held to be guided by the same. In consequence, that this consent of the Church is to be sought not from the people, but from their bishops, from the teachers and priests, *Vincent of Lirin*s formerly rightly observed : “ Consent also in like manner we shall arrive at,” says he “ if in this very antiquity we follow the definitions and expressed opinions of all, or, at any rate, of nearly all, the priests and teachers.” And indeed this position, namely, “ that the consent of the Universal Church is to be sought not from the people, but from the bishops and clergy,” is one of those very many points in which we have the Universal Church itself agreeing ; seeing that when about to discuss ecclesiastical matters, she hath rarely suffered the people to be present, never to deliver an opinion, or to vote. For neither, in all the councils which have ever been held on matters of that sort, do we read, that any one from among the people set his name to the decrees. But in each age the common affairs of the Church were transacted by bishops alone in council assembled, with, occasionally, certain presbyters, holding the places of their respective bishops. Which councils, if held in any one province, represented that *provincial* Church alone ; but if attended by all conjointly, or by

the majority of them, they then represented the *Universal Church*. "By which" (councils), as Tertullian says, "both such points as are of a deeper character are discussed in common, and the very assembly, as representing the whole Christian name, is held in great reverence." But councils of this sort, as well *provincial*, held by particular provinces, as *Universal*, held (as the origin of their name declares) by the Universal Church, such councils are even now extant, with many of their acts and decrees. There are extant also very many commentaries of individual bishops and presbyters, not indeed of all, but yet of those who, in each age, were most learned, and best acquainted with the doctrines and rites of the Church. From all of which, we are able most clearly to see (if any other thing) the common opinions both of all, and each of, the Churches, and so to collect most assuredly what we are to hold on these points. For although we grant it to be doubtful whether others, who either were not authors, or whose writings are not now in existence, may not perchance have held otherwise, yet since that is not capable of proof, and not to be capable of proof, in causes of this sort, is manifestly the same as not to exist; whatever all, or the majority of those, whose genuine works have been left us, taught, as it were in common, that is without any doubt, to be held for the common and constant doctrine of the Universal Church. Especially when the Universal Church also has itself fully enough testified her agreement to that doctrine, which is preserved in the ancient writings of Councils and Fathers, from this fact, that, the providence of God so ordering, she hath preserved to us those writings in which that doctrine is contained, the commentaries, in the mean time, of others, who held otherwise, having been buried in so deep oblivion, that scarcely have their names been transmitted to posterity. From all which things, as briefly and summarily premised, we may rightly conclude, that all, both separate works of individual fathers, and acts and monuments of Synods, as well provincial as universal, which exist at this day, are, in the first place, of this very great and remarkable use to us, in that from them we may consider as certainly proved, what the Universal Church hath ever believed and openly taught, on necessary

articles of Faith and rites ecclesiastical, and therefore what is to be ever believed and taught in the Church. For no one can doubt, but that it is both most safe, and supremely necessary, in all things, as far as is possible, religiously to walk in the steps of the faith and customs of the Universal Church.

5. But perhaps some one may say, "that the Fathers, both separately as individuals, and many of them conjointly, erred in various points of religion; and that they at times disagree among themselves, and that indeed, sometimes, on matters of great moment." These objections, I confess, against the ancient Fathers of the Church, and their authority in the settlement of ecclesiastical controversies, have been of late introduced. But whether they be true or false, is a point which we need not now discuss. For, even if we grant them true to the fullest extent, yet can no argument be drawn from them against our judgment concerning the *right use of the Fathers*. Inasmuch as we are speaking of the Fathers, not as individuals taken separately, but as taken all conjointly. And therefore how many errors soever may have been detected in one or more, and how much soever in some things, possibly, of great moment, they may even disagree with one another, or at least may appear to disagree, yet our position remains firm enough and stable, since there are certainly, after allowance made for them, many things, on which an agreement prevails among all the Fathers universally, and very many, to which a majority of them have given their united assent. But all the dissensions which have been raised among them on certain subjects, take nothing from their supreme authority on those points in which they agree, but rather in an eminent degree confirm it. For the fact, that in other things they have differed, most plainly manifests, that those things, on which they have agreed, they have handed down, not from any compact or agreement, not from any party formed, not from any communication of design, nor finally, from their own private opinions, but naked and unadulterated, as derived from the common and general interpretation and tradition of the Universal Church. And, indeed, although on certain less necessary points, as well of faith as of discipline, the ancient Fathers do in some little degree differ

one from another, yet that very many things have been received with the fullest agreement by all, is so clear, that we may judge of it with our own eyes. For there are many things which we see have been defined by the Universal Church in councils truly œcumenical, many things which have been approved by the consent of several, many things again by the consent of all the writers of the Church; many things, finally, concerning which there was in ancient times no controversy moved, some of this class have been mentioned by us above, to which very many others may be added. Those especially which, although not definitively prescribed in holy Scripture, have yet been retained by our very pious and prudent reformers of the English Church.

6. For when this our English Church, through long communion with the Roman Church, had contracted like stains with her, from which it was necessary that it should be cleansed, they who took that excellent and very necessary work in hand, fearing that they, like others, might rush from one extreme to the other, removed indeed those things, as well doctrines as ceremonies, which the Roman Church had newly and insensibly superinduced, and, as was fit, abrogated them utterly. Yet notwithstanding, whatsoever things had been, at all times, believed and observed, by all Churches, in all places, those things they most religiously took care not so to abolish with them. For they well knew, that all particular Churches are to be formed on the model of the Universal Church, if indeed, according to that general and received rule in ethics, "every part which agreeth not with its whole is therein base." Hence therefore these first reformers of this particular Church directed the whole line of that reformation, which they undertook, according to the rule of the whole or universal Church, casting away those things only which had been either unheard of, or rejected by, the Universal Church, but most religiously retaining those which they saw, on the other side, corroborated by the consent of the Universal Church. Whence it hath been brought to pass, that although we have not communion with the Roman, nor with certain other particular Churches, as at this day constituted, yet have we abiding communion with the

Universal and Catholic Church, of which evidently ours, as by the aid of God first constituted, and by his pity still preserved, is the perfect image and representation.

7. But, that we digress no further from our proposed object, when we are speaking of the *Universal* Church, and its agreement, without any doubt, regard is to be had especially to the *Primitive* Church: inasmuch as, although it be only a part of the whole, yet is it universally agreed that it was the more pure and genuine part. For the same hath happened to the Church, which hath happened to each several commonwealth, namely, that, ancient customs passing by degrees into disuse, new institutions are devised by the wanton imaginations of men's minds, which very fault is above all other to be eschewed in religion. For it is agreed among all Christians, that the Apostolic Church as constituted by the Apostles of our Lord in person, under the guidance of Divine inspiration, and by them whilst yet living administered, was of all Churches the purest and most perfect. Furthermore nothing seems more at variance with the common faith of Christians than that the doctrine or discipline instituted by the Apostles, should have been corrupted or any way changed by their immediate successors. For all confess, that the Apostles were most faithful men, and of consequence willed to ordain none as their successors, except those whose faith and integrity was fully approved by themselves personally. Therefore the first successors of the Apostles doubtless kept inviolate and uncorrupted the Church, whose government had been entrusted to them; and in like manner handed it down to their own successors, and these again to others, and so on; insomuch that there can exist no doubt, but that at least during two or three ages from the Apostles, the Church flourished in her primitive vigour, and, so to say, in her virgin estate, that is, in the same condition in which she had been left by the Apostles themselves; except that from time to time new heresies burst forth even in those days, by which the Church was indeed harassed, but in no way corrupted; clearly no more than the Church, strictly Apostolic, was perverted by those errors, which arose whilst the Apos-

ties were yet living. For they had scarcely time to rise up, before they were rejected by the Catholic Church. Which things therefore notwithstanding, the Universal Church which followed ever held that *Primitive Church* to be most pure, and, in refuting all heresies which afterwards arose, appealed to her as the rule of other Churches. For if any one endeavoured to bring any thing new into the doctrine or discipline of the Church, those Fathers who opposed themselves to him, whether individually or assembled together in a body, sought their arguments, as out of the holy Scriptures, so also out of the doctrines and traditions of the Church of the first ages. For this is observable in nearly all acts of councils, and commentaries of individual Fathers, wherever, that is, ecclesiastical controversies are discussed. And indeed nothing still is more rational, nothing certainly more desirable, than that all particular Churches at this day wherever constituted, were reformed after the model of the *Primitive Church*. For this measure would immediately cast forth whatever corruptions have crept in during later ages, and would restore to their ancient original, on the other hand, all things which are required for the true constitution of a Christian Church.

PATRICK, BISHOP.—*On Tradition.*

And farther we likewise acknowledge, that the sum and substance of the Christian Religion, contained in the Scriptures, hath been delivered down to us, even from the Apostles' days, in other ways or forms, besides the Scriptures. For instance, in the Baptismal Vow, in the Creed, in the Prayers and Hymns of the Church, which we may call Traditions, if we please; but they bring down to us no new Doctrine, but only deliver, in an abridgement, the same Christianity which we find in the Scriptures.

Upon this there is no need that I should enlarge; but I proceed farther to affirm,

That we reverently receive also the unanimous Tradition or Doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the meaning of the holy Scripture, and makes it more clear and unques-

tionable in any point of Faith, wherein we can find it hath declared its sense. For we look upon this Tradition as nothing else but the Scripture unfolded ; not a new thing, which is not in the Scripture ; but the Scripture explained and made more evident.

And thus some part of the Nicene Creed may be called a Tradition ; as it hath expressly delivered unto us the sense of the Church of God, concerning that great Article of our Faith, that **JESUS CHRIST** is the Son of God, which they teach us was always thus understood : the Son of God, “ begotten of his Father before all worlds, and of the same substance with the Father.”

But this Tradition supposes the Scripture for its ground, and delivers nothing but what the Fathers, assembled at Nice, believed to be contained there, and was first fetched from thence. For we find in Theodoret (L. i. 66.) that the famous Emperor Constantine, admonished those Fathers, in all their questions and debates, to consult only with these heavenly inspired writings ; “ because the Evangelical and Apostolical Books, and the oracles of the old Prophets, do evidently instruct us what to think in Divine matters.” This is so clear a testimony, that in those days they made this complete rule of their faith, whereby they ended controversies, (which was the reason that in several other Synods we find they were wont to lay the Bible before them,) and that there is nothing in the Nicene Creed, but what is to be found in the Bible ; that Cardinal Bellarmine hath nothing to reply to it, but this : “ Constantine was indeed a great Emperor, but no great Doctor.” Which is rather a scoff, than an answer ; and casts a scorn not only upon him but upon that great council, who, as the same Theodoret witnesseth, assented unto that speech of Constantine. So it there follows in these words : “ The most of the Synod were obedient to what he had discoursed, and embraced both mutual concord and sound doctrine.”

And accordingly St. Hilary a little after extols his son Constantius for this, that he adhered to the Scriptures ; and blames him only for not attending to the true Catholic sense of them. His words are these, (in his little Book which he delivered to Constantine) “ I truly admire thee, O Lord Constantius the Em-

peror, who desirest a Faith according to what is written." They pretended to no other in those days ; but (as he speaks a little after) looked upon him that refused this, as Antichrist. It was only required that they should receive their Faith out of God's Books, not merely according to the words of them, but according to their true meaning, (because many "spake Scripture without Scripture, and pretended to Faith without Faith," as his words are) ; and herein Catholic and constant Tradition was to guide them. For whatsoever was contrary to what the whole Church had received and held from the beginning, could not in reason be thought to be the meaning of that Scripture which was alleged to prove it. And, on the other side, the Church pretended to no more than to be a witness of the received sense of the Scriptures ; which were the bottom upon which they built this Faith.

Thus I observe Hegesippus saith, (in Euseb. his History, L. iv. c. 22.) that when he was at Rome, he met with a great many Bishops, and that "he received the very same Doctrine from them all." And then, a little after, tells us what that was, and whence they derived it, saying, "That in every succession of Bishops, and in every City, so they held ; as the Law preached, and as the Prophets, and as the Lord." That is according to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament.

I shall conclude this particular with a pregnant passage which I remember in a famous Divine of our Church, (Dr. Jackson, in his Treatise of the Catholic Church, chap. 22,) who writes to this effect :—

That Tradition which was of so much use in the Primitive Church, was not unwritten Traditions or Customs, commended or ratified by the supposed infallibility of any visible Church, but did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. And the unanimous consent of so many several Churches, as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, out of such forms as had been framed and taught before this controversy arose, about the Divinity of Christ ; and that voluntarily and freely (these Churches being not dependent one upon another, nor overruled by any authority over them, nor misled by faction to frame their confessions of Faith by imitation, or ac-

cording to some pattern set them), was a pregnant argument, that this faith wherein they all agreed, had been delivered to them by the Apostles and their followers, and was the true meaning of the holy writings in this great Article ; and evidently proved, that Arius did obtrude such interpretations of Scripture, as had not been heard of before ; or were but the sense of some private persons in the Church, and not of the generality of believers.

In short the unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as exhibited their several Confessions, Catechisms, or Testimonies of their own or forefathers' Faith, unto the Council of Nice, was an argument of the same force and efficacy against Arius and his partakers, as the general consent and practice of all nations, in worshipping a Divine Power in all ages, is against Atheists. Nothing but the ingrafted notion of a Deity, could have induced so many several nations, so much different in natural disposition, in civil discipline and education, to affect or practise the duty of Adoration. And nothing but the evidence of "the ingrafted word" (as St. James calls the Gospel) delivered by CHRIST and his Apostles in the holy Scriptures, could have kept so many several Churches as communicated their confessions unto that Council, in the unity of the same Faith.

The like may be said of the rest of the four first General Councils ; whose decrees are a great confirmation of our belief, because they deliver to us the consent of the Churches of Christ, in those great truths which they assert out of the holy Scriptures.

And could there any Traditive Interpretation of the whole Scripture be produced upon the authority of such original Tradition, as that now named, we would most thankfully and joyfully receive it. But there never was any such pretended ; no, not by the Roman Church, whose Doctors differ among themselves about the meaning of hundreds of places in the Bible. Which they would not do sure, nor spend their time unprofitably in making the best conjectures they are able, if they knew of any exposition of those places in which all Christian Doctors had agreed from the beginning.

But more than this, we allow that Tradition gives us a consi-

derable assistance in such points as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence, by good and manifest reasoning. Or, in plainer words perhaps, whatsoever Tradition justifies any Doctrine that may be proved by the Scriptures, though not found in express terms there, we acknowledge to be of great use, and readily receive and follow it, as serving very much to establish us more firmly in that truth, when we see all Christians have adhered to it.

This may be called a confirming Tradition: of which we have an instance in the Doctrine of Infant Baptism, which some ancient Fathers call an Apostolical Tradition. Not that it cannot be proved by any place of Scripture; no such matter: for though we do not find it written in so many words that Infants are to be baptized, or that the Apostles baptised Infants: yet it may be proved out of the Scriptures; and the Fathers themselves, who call it an Apostolical Tradition, do allege testimonies of the Scriptures to make it good. And therefore we may be sure they comprehend the Scriptures within the name of Apostolical Tradition; and believed that this Doctrine was gathered out of the Scriptures, though not expressly treated of there.

In like manner we, in this Church, assert the authority of Bishops above Presbyters, by a Divine right; as appears by the Book of Consecration of Bishops, where the person to be ordained to this office, expresses his belief "that he is truly called to this Ministration according to the will of our LORD JESUS CHRIST." Now this we are persuaded may be plainly enough proved to any man that is ingenuous, and will fairly consider things, out of the holy Scriptures, without the help of Tradition: but we also take in the assistance of this for the conviction of gainsayers; and by the perpetual practice and Tradition of the Church from the beginning confirm our Scripture proofs so strongly, that he seems to us very obstinate, or extremely prejudiced, that yields not to them. And therefore to make our Doctrine in this point the more authentic, our Church hath put both these proofs together, in the preface to the form of giving orders, which begins in these words: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scrip-

ture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

I hope no body among us is so weak, as to imagine, when he reads this, that by admitting Tradition to be of such use and force as I have mentioned, we yield too much to the Popish cause, which supports itself by this pretence. But if any one shall suggest this to any of our people, let them reply, that it is but the pretence, and only by the name of Tradition, that the Romish Church supports itself: For true Tradition is as great a proof against Popery, as it is for Episcopacy. The very foundation of the Pope's Empire (which is his succession in St. Peter's Supremacy) is utterly subverted by this; the constant Tradition of the Church being evidently against it. And therefore let us not lose this advantage we have against them, by ignorantly refusing to receive true and constant Tradition; which will be so far from leading us into their Church, that it will never suffer us to think of being of it, while it remains so opposite to that which is truly Apostolical.

I conclude this with the direction which our Church gives to Preachers in the Book of Canons, 1571, (in the Title *Concionatores*,) That "no man shall teach the people any thing to be held and believed by them religiously, but what is consentaneous to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament; and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered out of that very doctrine." This is our Rule whereby we are to guide ourselves; which was set us on purpose to preserve our Preachers from broaching any idle, novel, or Popish Doctrines; as appears by the conclusion of that injunction: "vain and old wives' opinions, and Heresies, and Popish Errors, abhorring from the Doctrine and Faith of CHRIST, they shall not teach; nor any thing at all whereby the unskilful multitude may be inflamed either to the study of novelty, or to contention."

But though nothing may be taught as a piece of Religion, which hath not the fore-named original, yet I must add, that those things which have been universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture, though not written at all there, nor to be

proved from thence, we do receive as pious opinions. For instance, the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God our SAVIOUR, which is so likely a thing, and so universally received, that I do not see why we should not look upon it as a genuine Apostolical Tradition.

I have but one thing more to add, which is, that we allow also the Traditions of the Church, about matters of Order, Rites, and Ceremonies. Only we do not take them to be parts of God's worship; and if they be not appointed in the holy Scriptures, we believe they may be altered by the same or the like authority with that which ordained them.—

As for what is delivered in matters of Doctrine, or Order, by any private Doctor in the Church, or by any particular Church, it appears by what hath been said, that it cannot be taken to be more than the private opinion of that man, or the particular decree of that Church, and can have no more authority than they have: that is, cannot oblige all Christians, unless it be contained in the holy Scripture.

Now such are the Traditions which the Roman Church would impose upon us, and impose upon us after a strange fashion.—

Our people may hereby be admonished not to suffer themselves to be deceived and abused by words and empty names, without their sense and meaning. Nothing is more common than this, especially in the business of Traditions, about which a stir is raised, and it is commonly given out, that we refuse all Traditions. Than which nothing is more false, for we refuse none truly so called; that is, Doctrine delivered by CHRIST, or His Apostles. No, we refuse nothing at all, because it is unwritten, but merely because we are not sure it is delivered by that authority to which we ought to submit.

Whatsoever is delivered to us by our LORD and His Apostles, we receive as the very word of God, which we think is sufficiently declared in the holy Scriptures. But if any can certainly prove, by any authority equal to that which brings the Scriptures to us, that there is any thing else delivered by them, we receive that also. The controversy will soon be at an end, for we are ready to embrace it when any such thing can be produced.

Nay, we have that reverence for those who succeeded the Apostles, that what they have unanimously delivered to us, as the sense of any doubtful place, we receive it, and seek no farther. There is no dispute whether or no we should entertain it.

To the Decrees of the Church also we submit in matters of Decency and Order ; yea, and acquiesce in its authority, when it determines doubtful opinions.

But we cannot receive that as a Doctrine of CHRIST, which we know is but the tradition of man, nor keep the ordinances of the ancient Church in matters of decency, so unalterably as never to vary from them, because they themselves did not intend them to be of everlasting obligation. As appears by the changes that have been made in several times and places ; even in some things which are mentioned in the holy Scriptures, being but customs suited to those ages and countries.

In short, Traditions we do receive, but not all that are called by that name. Those which have sufficient authority, but not those which are imposed upon us, by the sole authority of one particular Church, assuming a power over all the rest.—

It is a calumny to affirm, that the Church of England rejects all tradition, and I hope none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No, the Scripture itself is a tradition ; and we admit all other traditions which are subordinate, and agreeable unto that ; together with all those things which can be proved to be Apostolical by the general testimony of the Church in all ages : nay, if any thing not contained in Scripture, which the Roman Church now pretends to be a part of God's word, were delivered to us by as universal uncontrolled tradition as the Scripture is, we should receive it as we do the Scripture.

But it appears plainly that such things were at first but private opinions, which now are become the doctrines of that particular Church, who would impose her decrees upon us under the venerable name of Apostolical universal tradition ; which I have shown you hath been an ancient cheat, and that we ought not to be so easy as to be deceived by it. But to be very wary,

and afraid of trusting the traditions of such a Church, as hath not only perverted some, abolished others, and pretended them where there hath been none; but been a very unfaithful preserver of them, and that in matters of great moment, where there were some; and lastly, warrants those which it pretends to have kept, by nothing but its own infallibility. For which there is no tradition, but much against it, even in the original tradition, the Holy Scriptures; which plainly suppose the Roman Church may not only err, but utterly fail and be cut off from the Body of CHRIST; as they that please may read, who will consult the eleventh chapter to the Romans, v. 20, 21, 22. Of which they are in the greater danger, because they proudly claim so high a prerogative as that now mentioned, directly contrary to the Apostolical admonition in that place: "be not high-minded, but fear."—pp. 11. 16. 32.

SHARPE, ARCHBISHOP.—*Sermons.*

We see from hence how groundlessly, how unreasonably, we Protestants are charged with Heresy by our adversaries. They make no scruple of calling us Heretics, and telling us we shall be damned upon that account, unless we come over to their Belief. Why, what is it they would have us believe? We believe all that JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles taught to the world, so far as we have knowledge of it. We believe all the holy Scriptures, and not only so, but we make them the rule of our Faith. We believe all those articles of Faith, into which all Christians in every country, from CHRIST's time to this, have been baptized, and which by all the ancients have been accounted a perfect summary of the Christian Faith; nor do we hold any thing inconsistent with them. We own both CHRIST's Sacraments; and we administer them entirely. We renounce all the Heresies that were condemned by the ancient general Councils; nay, we are ready to refer ourselves to those Councils, and to the primitive Fathers who lived at that time, for the trial of all the points which are disputed between us. And lastly, we are sure we are not obstinate in our errors, if they should prove so; we are sure

we have no secular ends to serve in the maintaining them ; and most of all sure we are, that we are not self-condemned, that our own conscience doth not accuse us for being of this way ; (which yet is one of those things that go to the making of an Heretic). Now if all these things can be truly said of us, (as I think they may be truly said of the Church of England, and of all the honest members of it) how is it possible that we can in any sense be guilty of Heresy ? In the sense of the Scriptures and of the Fathers I am sure we are orthodox Christians ; and in the sense of the greatest Divines, even in the Roman Communion, I am sure we are no Heretics. And if after all that, we must be branded with that name, all that we can say is, that “after the way which they call Heresy, so worship we the God of our Fathers.”—Vol. vi. p. 5.

*Ibid.*

We do not find, that in the controversies which arose in the ancient Church about matters of Faith, the guides of the Church ever made use of this argument of the Church's infallibility for the quieting and ending of them : which yet, had they known of any such thing, had been the properest and the easiest means they could have used. Nay further we know, that the ancient Fathers had another method of confuting Heretics and Schismatics than by appealing to the Church's infallibility : namely, by bringing their doctrines to be tried by the ancient usages and doctrines of the Apostolic Churches, and especially by the Divine oracles of Scripture, which they looked upon as the entire and only Rule of Faith.—Vol. vii. p. 61.

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.*

To begin with Faith, the foundation of all other Christian duties. You cannot be ignorant, what attempts have lately been made, and are still daily further advancing, to destroy some of the principal doctrines, not of ours only, but of the Catholic Church in all ages ; and I wish I could not say, to weaken and

undermine all the rest: "these things have not been done in a corner."

Great industry hath been used, and that with too much success, to revive the Arian and Semi-arian Heresies; and with the professors thereof to unite almost all other sects of Christians, however they may differ from one another as to opinion, in the same visible Communion. So that instead of rejecting those, who deprave the Christian Faith, as St. Paul commands; or, in obedience to St. John, of refusing even to "receive them into our houses," or to "bid them God speed;" should this design prevail, we must pray with them, and partake with them of the Lord's Table, and associate together in all other parts of religious worship; and those alone will be reputed Schismatics, who separate themselves from the Communion of Heretics.

Some have so far proceeded in this scheme of general comprehension, or rather confusion, as to assert, that all sorts of error, except those which immediately relate to practice, are innocent and unblameable. With these men one may, perhaps, deserve the name of an Heretic, who outwardly professeth something he inwardly disbelieves, and in that sense condemns himself: but in any other case, besides this of acting directly against the dictates of conscience, under which it is on all hands confessed to be a fault to defend the truth itself, they plainly intimate, that there is no harm in maintaining even the doctrine of Mahomet, or any other, though ever so opposite to the Christian Revelation. We must not, therefore, wonder to hear it affirmed, that in order to be justified before God, there is no need of anything more, than to act agreeably to our present inward persuasion, or in other terms, with sincerity; or, that equal degrees of this quality will in all cases (for I find no exception made) entitle men to equal degrees of Divine favour: whence it follows, that they who denied, or even crucified our SAVIOUR, provided they did it without remorse or hesitation, might deserve an equal reward with those, who are martyrs for Him.

We have been accustomed, and this agreeably to the judgment of all other Churches, and the most evident principles both of

Natural and Revealed Religion, to think it the duty of Christian princes to maintain God's true Religion and virtue; and the Church, our Mother, hath taught us in the Communion office to pray, that all in authority under them may do the same. Now, if by God's true Religion nothing be meant, but that moral virtue, from which it is plainly distinguished in this place, then our new masters may still perhaps allow the magistrate to execute this part of his office; but, if God's true Religion signifies that, which it always hath signified among Christians, the worship of One True God, as opposed to that of idols and false gods, or the way of worship prescribed in the Holy Scripture, in opposition to Heathenish, and other superstitions; or, if God's true Religion be understood to imply the belief of Three Persons in one Godhead, of the Incarnation, sufferings, and satisfaction of CHRIST, of the Resurrection of the Body, or of any other doctrine ever so plainly revealed by God; then it is openly declared, that for Christian magistrates to discourage false Religion, even in the least degree, or to favour and encourage that which is true, is to do something highly inconsistent both with the nature and ends of their own authority, and with the kingdom of CHRIST.

This may seem strange doctrine in a Christian country: but, since the Faith was for several ages maintained without the favour or protection of the civil magistrate, they, who advance these and the like novel opinions, may perhaps be thought more excusable, if they endeavour to recompense for the loss of these temporal advantages by their hearty concern and just zeal for that spiritual power, which our Lord hath left in His Church. But, instead of this, these men describe the Church, rather as a number of persons disunited from, and independent on one another, than as an orderly society under lawful governors of Divine, or necessary appointment; and thus root up, as far as in them lieth, the very foundation of all Ecclesiastical authority at once. It might easily be shown, how by the schemes lately published, every branch of this authority hath been very much weakened and impaired; or, rather, totally subverted and destroyed: but I shall confine myself to the subject, of which I have been

chiefly speaking, viz. the Christian Faith; in things relating to which, it hath been thought, not only highly inconvenient, but absurd and impracticable for the Church to have any sort of authority whatsoever. Our own Church, indeed, in her twentieth article hath expressly declared, that the Church hath authority in controversies of Faith; and therefore some of them, who do not approve this passage, have taken great pains to persuade the world, that it was not originally in the article, but inserted there by some, who affected more power, than of right belonged to them: but this attempt not succeeding according to their desires, the rest always speak of it with such reservations and evasions, as plainly show they heartily wish it were quite expunged. One of the chief causes of their complaint, is the obliging men to declare their assent to human decisions, as they are called; that is, to articles of Faith, or doctrines, which however clearly deduced from the Holy Scriptures, are not found there in express words. For, when “unlearned and unstable” men, to use the words of St. Peter, “wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction,” it was always customary, even from the most primitive ages, for the Church, in order to prevent the spreading of such infections, to require her members, especially such of them as had been distinguished by any public character, to make an open and solemn confession of their Faith; not in the very words of Holy Scripture, which had been perverted and misunderstood, because that would have been ineffectual to the purpose intended; but in others more fully, and distinctly setting forth the true sense and interpretation of those words. With this view it was, that the Fathers of Nice inserted into their Creed those clauses, which declare the true Divinity of our Blessed Lord, against Arius; that not long after, in opposition to the Heresy of Macedonius, others were added by the general Council of Constantinople, to assert the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; and that in the next century, though no further change was made in the Creed, other declarations of the true Faith, concerning the Incarnation of CHRIST, and the Personal Union of His two Natures, were composed by general Synods assembled at Ephesus and Chalcedon, when the two opposite Heresies of

Nestorius and Eutyches first showed themselves in the world. In these later times, indeed, this authority hath been very much abused ; instead of articles of Faith, men have been compelled to declare their assent, not only to disputable opinions, but to such, as are evidently contrary, as well to the principles of natural reason, as to the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the best ages ; and those worthy men, whom God endued with power from on high, to withstand these unjust impositions, have been exposed to so many and great trials, as even the first Christians endured in the Heathen persecutions. These practices, together with the principles from which they proceed, can hardly be too much detested : but shall we then, instead of reforming these or the like abuses, quite discard that sacred authority which hath been abused ? . . .

But I am in hopes, that in the opinion of every true son of this Church, it will be a sufficient confutation of all innovations, which have been, or hereafter shall be, advanced, to say with St. Paul, “ we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God ;” or, in the words of our Blessed LORD, “ from the beginning it was not so.” To become the author of new Hypotheses in Religion, or to call those doctrines into question, which have always been firmly believed in the Church, even from the most early ages to our times, savours more of the pride and arrogance of some vain-glorious philosopher, who by making strange discoveries, and contradicting the rest of the world, seeks to raise in others a great esteem of himself, than of the humility of a good Christian ; whose chief glory consists in the entire resignation of his understanding, and the stedfast belief of all the truths, which God hath revealed to him, whether he doth, or doth not, clearly comprehend them. I speak not of improvements in the liberal arts and sciences ; which had their rise from study and observation, and therefore must be advanced, and perfected in the same method : whereas the Christian Religion having been completely published to the world by our Blessed LORD, and His Apostles, no addition can be made to it without a new Revelation. Here, then, is no room for invention or discovery ; but, on the contrary, if any doctrine be new, if it be not truly primitive and

Apostolical, we may, safely, without further examination, reject it as false and spurious, and no part of “the Faith once delivered to the Saints.” Whence our best writers, as well in their controversies with the Papists, as with other Sectaries and Heretics, constantly appeal to the judgment and practice of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles : which as she had better means of information, than can be pretended to in any succeeding age, so cannot reasonably be supposed, either through negligence or design, and this, in all parts of the world at once, to have depraved the Faith, whilst her Pastors, and other chief members, were daily suffering martyrdom in its defence : and few there are, or rather none at all, as far as I have been able to observe, who refuse to allow the testimony of the primitive writers its due weight and authority, such only excepted, as have not read them, or are afraid of their evidence, and, therefore, in order to divert us from the true sense of the Holy Scriptures, (in discovering which those interpreters have commonly the best success, who most carefully compare them with other books of the same or the next ages, as the best critics always do in explaining other authors) would strictly confine us to the mere words, because these alone, and unsupported, may more easily be forced to countenance their innovations.—*Works*, vol. i. pp. 283. 296.

### *Defence of the Charge.*

There is not, therefore, the least ground to think, that the practice of the Church in this respect is contrary to Scripture. Let us now see, whether this writer hath succeeded better in another accusation he hath brought against it, viz. that it is Popish. I have allowed that this practice hath been abused to very ill ends by the Church of Rome ; which, instead of explaining the true sense of Scripture, hath invented and imposed new Articles of Faith, contrary both to Scripture and reason. Which doth by no means satisfy this writer, who will, therefore, have the practice itself to be Popish ; for unless he means this, he would, instead of contradicting me, say only the same thing I have done before. He pretends, that “ by this engine it was that

step by step came on the claim of Infallibility." (p. 252.) Whereby if he understands that the authority of the Church was through the ambition of some men, and the negligence of others, so far by degrees increased and abused, that at length a claim of Infallibility was set up, he affirms nothing more than what I have allowed, that this authority hath been much abused; but then I must still put him in mind, that the abuse of authority in one age is no just ground for laying it aside in another. But if he would have it thought that the claim of Infallibility is a certain or necessary concomitant, or consequent, of this authority as exercised at the Council of Nice, or the other general councils mentioned by me, he must pardon me if this be not granted; for there is nothing more evident in History, than that no such authority was either then, or for many hundred years after claimed by any person in the world. Nay, so far was anything done in these councils from giving birth to the exorbitant power of the Pope, who claims this Infallibility, that the popish writers have never been able to prove, that in several of them he was allowed so much as to preside; and even in the last of them, that at Chalcedon, the See of Constantinople was, notwithstanding the warm and earnest opposition of the Pope's Legates, put upon the level with that of Rome, agreeably to what had been before decreed at Constantinople in the second General Council. These councils, therefore, are so many plain proofs against the Pope's authority, and are commonly insisted on as such by the Protestant writers. Neither doth it appear, that any authority was there exercised in relation to the interpretation of Scripture, which is not exercised or approved by the Church of England and other Protestant Churches: for in these there are Creeds, or Confessions of Faith; and such as reject any of the principal Articles of these Creeds, or Confessions, are commonly debarred both from Holy Orders, and also from Communion. This, therefore, having been the practice of Protestant Churches, and particularly of the Church of England, ever since the Reformation, which cannot be questioned, will, I hope, be excused from the imputation of serving the popish claim of Infallibility; unless it can be supposed, that the Protestant Churches, and this, from the very

beginning, have generally so far misunderstood, or acted inconsistently with their own principles, as to retain the very essence of popery. But to give some show or colour of popery to the practice of which I have been speaking, this writer hath filled his discourse with long and heavy complaints of the injustice of denying Christians the liberty of examining, and judging for themselves ; in which unfair proceeding of his, I desire leave once more to say, that I am no farther concerned than the body of Protestants ; who, as they invite men to read the Scriptures, and to see with their own eyes, so have never denied the Church authority to judge what persons are qualified for her Communion and for Holy Orders.

I must not forget under this head, that I am again charged not only with favouring Popery, but with being a Papist in disguise, with “acknowledging the Protestant principles for decency sake, but steadfastly adhering to the Popish” (p. 275), and all this, as it seems, for having referred you to the practice and writers of the Primitive times, and of the next ages after the Apostles ; whereby I am represented to understand the reign of Constantine, which happened, as he saith (pp. 270—274.), almost three hundred years after. Now I am not in the least apprehensive of my being suspected as a favourer of Popery by any man, who knows the true meaning of Popery ; but sure it is such a compliment to the Popish Religion, as no Protestant would have made, who understands his own principles, to date its rise from the time of Constantine ; the claim of Infallibility, and of the Papal Supremacy, as now exercised, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Image Worship, Prayers in an unknown tongue, forbidding laymen to read the Scriptures, to say nothing of other peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome, having never been heard of during the reign of this great Emperor, or for a long time after ; as a very little insight into the Popish Controversies, or Ecclesiastical Historians, would have informed this writer. It would have been much more to his purpose, and equally consistent with truth and justice, to have told his readers that by the next ages after the Apostles, I meant the times immediately preceding the Reformation : but then one oppor-

tunity would have been lost of declaiming against the times wherein the Nicene Creed was composed, and Arianism condemned. As to the primitive writers I am not ashamed, or afraid to repeat, that the best method of interpreting Scripture seems to me to be the having recourse to the writers, who lived nearest the time wherein the Scriptures were first published, that is, to the next ages after the Apostles ; and that a diligent inquiry into the Faith and practice of the Church in the same ages, would be the most effectual way, next after the study of the Scriptures themselves, to prevent innovations in doctrine ; and, lastly, that this hath been practised with great success by some of our best advocates for the Protestant cause, as Bishop Jewel, for example, Archbishop Laud, Archbishop Ussher, Bishop Cosins, Bishop Stillingfleet, Dr. Barrow, Bishop Bull, with many others at home and abroad. To which it will be replied : That “ our best writers, at least, in their controversies with the Papists, are so far from appealing to the judgment of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles, in any such sense as the Bishop is arguing for against his adversaries ; that the very best of them, Mr. Chillingworth, has declared upon the most mature consideration, how uncertain generally, how self-contradictory sometimes, how insufficient always he esteemed this judgment to be. He had seen Fathers against Fathers, Councils against Councils, the consent of one age against the consent of another ; the same Fathers contradicting themselves, and the like, and he found no rest but in the Protestant Rule of Faith. He was willing to yield to every thing as truth, *Quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus* ; because he well judged that nothing could be conceived to be embraced as truth at the very beginning, and so continue in all places, and at all times, but what was delivered at the beginning. But he saw, with respect to some controverted points, how early the difference of sentiment was.” (p. 265. 266.) In answer to this, I shall not take upon me to determine what rank Mr. Chillingworth ought to bear among the Protestant writers ; it being sufficient for my purpose, that many others, and those of chief note for learning and judgment, in their controversies with the Papists and others, have appealed, and this in the manner I have

recommended, to the Primitive writers, as every one may soon learn who will take the pains to look into their books. In the next place, it appears from this very passage of Mr. Chillingworth, as here represented, that this design was to prevent appealing to Fathers and Councils as a Rule of Faith; agreeably whereunto I have all along declared, that, in my opinion, the Scripture is the only Rule of Faith, and have no farther recommended the study of the Primitive writers, than as the best method of discovering the true sense of Scripture. In the third place, here is nothing expressly said by Mr. Chillingworth of the most Primitive writers or Councils, or of any who lived in the next ages after the Apostles; but he may very well be understood, notwithstanding any thing here produced, of those latter ages, wherein both Fathers and Councils degenerated from the Faith and doctrine of those who went before them; which is the more likely, because mention here follows of the Article which divided the Greeks from the Roman Communion; this having not been openly disputed before the seventh century. Fourthly, he is introduced as speaking in express terms of controverted points, but saying nothing of any principal point of Faith, nothing of any Article which was originally in the Nicene Creed. On the contrary it may be observed, in the last place, that he plainly speaks of doctrines received by the Church in all places and at all times, even from the very beginning, which, for that reason, he presumed not to reject. Now it cannot possibly be known what these are, without having recourse to the writers of the Primitive ages. So that, upon the whole, the method I have recommended is so far from being contradicted, that it is rather enforced by what this writer hath cited from Mr. Chillingworth.—p. 358.

GRABE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Præfat. in Spicileg.*

It is the contempt of the Ecclesiastical Tradition, reaching down from the Apostolic age to our own, which causes Christians who are called to one Faith and to one hope, to split into various sects; each of which professes Scripture for its Rule of Faith, but bends our LORD's declarations to its private likings and

wishes, and refuses communion to all who differ from it, depriving them of all privileges, bodily and spiritual. On one side upon Traditions truly Catholic and Apostolic, are superadded new opinions and superstitions which falsely pretend to the name; on the other that is torn away, overlooked, nay, sometimes rejected which has been believed and practised in the Church always, everywhere, and by all, and for this sole reason, because it is inconsistent with the new decrees and determinations, or altogether hostile to them.—Meanwhile, till public peace is restored to the world, we must see to our own private peace and safety, lest we be involved in the aforementioned evils, and perish in the ruin of others. We shall escape this mischief if we build ourselves up upon the faith once delivered to the Saints, and best unfolded in the writings of the ancient Fathers, not admitting aught which beyond or against it be latterly added, uncertain, false, vain, superstitious, idolatrous, nor agreeing with those who detract from the traditions of the Catholic Church, and contentiously revile the most ancient doctrine and discipline, nay, those who do not obey it with their whole heart.

*Id.—De forma Consecrationis Eucharisticæ.*

The form of consecration and opinion of the consecrated elements, in which both Catholics and Heretics, in the age immediately succeeding the holy Apostles, have agreed together, and which, ever since, has been kept in all ancient Churches, and is by some of the Fathers expressly reckoned amongst the unwritten apostolical traditions, and is moreover hinted at in the very writings of the New Testament, cometh undoubtedly from the Apostles, if not from our LORD himself, and ought, therefore, by no means to be changed, otherwise it will make the consecration doubtful, or at least unlawful for them that understand this matter. It is, therefore, an indispensable duty incumbent upon every Christian Church, and every priest in it, strictly to keep to the same matter and form, which our LORD JESUS CHRIST and his holy Apostles have used in the first institution and celebration of this sacred mystery, and to do in and with it what these have done, lest if they diminish or take aught off it, they

should lose either the substance or the benefit of this most holy Sacrament, and consequently, if through ignorance or mistake a fault or defect hath happened any where in these things, it is the bounden duty of the bishops and priests of that Church to rectify the same, the received customs and human laws notwithstanding ; and of every one who, by reading the holy Scriptures and writings of the ancient Apostolical Fathers, is come to the knowledge of such fault or defect, to put them in mind of it, and to shew the same in order that it may be amended, since every one who knoweth the truth and doth not declare it, shall be judged by the LORD on the last day.—p. 75. 84.

BRETT, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*On Tradition.*

Since then the will of GOD being once revealed, is to be known afterwards by tradition only, it behoves us to inquire how we may be satisfied that this tradition does not deceive us: for it is a general opinion here that tradition is very deceitful and not at all to be relied upon ; and I do readily grant that mere oral tradition delivered from father to son, corroborated by no written evidence, is by no means to be relied upon for any long succession. And, therefore, we find that no nation or country, can give any tolerably satisfactory account of the state and condition of their ancestors, before they come to have the use of letters amongst them, by which their manners, laws, customs, and acts, might be transmitted to posterity. But this is no argument against such a tradition as is delivered or corroborated by written evidence, of such things, and in such manner, as we cannot think ourselves deceived by it. All our knowledge of laws, customs, and facts, which we are not ourselves eye-witnesses of, must be delivered to us by evidence, such as we have reason to believe, and we have no other way of coming to the knowledge of them. Now we could not be eye-witnesses of what happened before we were born, therefore, we must either say that we can come to the true knowledge of nothing which happened before we were born, which I think none but down-right Sceptics will pretend to say, or else that we must believe

such tradition as deserves the name of a just and proper evidence; and I conceive that to be just and proper evidence, which we receive from those who could not be themselves deceived in what they relate, nor could have any design or purpose to deceive us in the relation, but on the contrary, must have exposed themselves to all their contemporaries, if they had given a wrong account of those matters. Therefore when an author of credit speaks of the customs or practice of the Church at a time when he lived, we have all the reason imaginable to believe him; for in that case it is certain he could not be deceived himself, neither could he write what was false in such a case without exposing himself to all that were living at that time. Thus for instance, if any one at this time should tell the world, that it is the custom or practice of the Church of England to carry the Host or consecrated Eucharistical Bread in a solemn procession, as they do in the Church of Rome, he must expose himself as a shameless liar, and could never be esteemed an author of any credit, because every man now living in England would know the thing to be false. Nay, if he should say that this was the practice in this realm an hundred and fifty years ago, or any time since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, every Englishman would know it to be false, though there is no man now living that can remember what was done in her reign. And the like may be said with regard to any other public part of Divine worship. No man can impose upon the world so far, as to make them believe that any thing is a public practice, which he himself does not know, or see to be so. And though a man might possibly put upon a stranger, who may be supposed ignorant of the customs of the people, to whom he is a stranger; yet he that had the least value for his own reputation, would not dare to do this to a stranger living among the people of whose customs he pretends to give him an account, especially, if by that account he hopes to obtain a favour from that stranger, and may have just apprehensions of suffering through the displeasure of that stranger, if he should go about to deceive him. We may therefore be satisfied that St. Barnabas, for instance, would not have told the Jews that God had

appointed us to keep holy the eighth day, or first day of the week, in memory of CHRIST's resurrection, and abolished the observation of the Sabbath day, if the Apostles had not taught this as the will of GOD: for he could not be deceived in this matter himself, being a companion of the Apostles, and well acquainted with the doctrine which they taught. Neither could he, if he would, put a deceit in this case upon any others, because all the Christians then living could have refuted him if he had uttered a falsehood in this particular. Therefore, though we do not place his Epistle among the inspired writings, yet we cannot question his evidence as to this matter. And the same may be said of Justin Martyr; if he had told the Emperors any falsehood with relation to the practice of the Christians, it was impossible but they must easily have discovered it, not a Christian then living but must have known it to be a falsehood, if it had been so; consequently he would not only have exposed himself as a shameless liar, but would likewise have made himself liable to the just displeasure of the Emperors, if he had not spoke the truth: nay, if any thing that he told the Emperors had been a new practice, and such as had not been the constant practice of the Christian Church from the beginning, he durst not have pleaded in behalf of such a practice as a Christian institution, for which so many Christians then living could have convicted him of falsehood, it being but forty years from the death of the Apostles when he wrote, and many of the Apostles' disciples who learned the Christian institutions immediately from them, being then alive. Justin then could not be deceived himself with regard to the Christian institutions, since he had opportunity of informing himself from the immediate disciples of the Apostles, and he durst not pretend to impose upon the Emperors, nor could have any interest either to write a false relation to them, or to put a cheat upon those that should come after. Therefore what we find to have been delivered as a custom of the Church, by St. Barnabas, or St. Justin, or any writers contemporary to them, that we firmly believe to have been of Apostolical institution. And we may say the same also of those that fol-

lowed them for one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, such as Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and their contemporaries, who could no more be put upon, and made to believe that any thing was an Apostolical institution, and publicly practised by the whole Church, than any man of sense and learning could now be put upon, and made to believe that such a thing (though really it was not so) was established here at the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, and had continued to be the practice of the English Church ever since. And the same may be said if we add fifty or sixty years more to the account, which brings us down to the time of the Council of Nice. A Christian Synod could no more be deceived at that time in declaring the doctrine and practice taught and practised by the Apostles, than a bench of English Judges could be deceived in any law or custom which should be pretended to have been begun here in the reign of King Henry VII. And, therefore, where we have the declaration of that Council, or of any authors contemporary with it, or with any members of it, I conceive we may very reasonably depend upon their testimony for the truth of an Apostolical tradition. The testimony of the Church, therefore, is thus far at least to be esteemed a certain evidence of Divine or Apostolical institutions, and hitherto we may safely follow it without danger of being led into error by so doing; and that which may confirm us that hitherto the Church had not been deceived with regard to Apostolical institutions and practices is, her unanimity in those matters. Whatever was held as derived from Apostolic authority by one Church, was esteemed as such also by all other Churches, which could not have been if there had been a failure in the tradition; for error is various, and all Churches from East to West, from North to South, from one end of the world to another, could never have agreed in an erroneous tradition. Therefore where we find all Churches agreed in the same doctrines and forms of worship, and we are not able to trace the beginning of them, we may safely conclude that they are derived to us from the Apostles: for this is the rule laid down by St. Austin on this occasion: "what-

soever the universal Church holdeth, and which was not instituted by any Council, but has been always observed, that we most rightly conclude to have been a tradition derived from Apostolical authority." And in another place he says, "many things which are not to be found in their writings," (that is, in the writings of the Apostles) "nor in the Councils of later ages, yet because they are observed by the whole Church, are believed not to have been delivered or recommended by any authority but of them." Again, says he, "there are many things which the universal Church holds, and which for this reason are rightly believed to be commanded by the Apostles, although they are not found written." But it is to be observed, that it is only such traditions as have been held by the universal Church in all ages, and all places, such as we can trace up to the Apostolical age, and have the evidence of some of the Fathers, who living either in the Apostolical times, or so near to them, that they could not but distinguish between Apostolical traditions and later institutions, have given their testimony concerning. And therefore we justly reject the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of Saints, worship of relics and images, and other corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, because we cannot find any evidence for their universality and antiquity. We can trace the original of all of them, and find them many years later than the times of the Apostles: but on the contrary we find the doctrines and customs of the ages nearest to the Apostles to be directly opposite to these modern traditions. It is not then every tradition that lays an obligation upon Christians, but only such traditions as we have good evidence to believe to have been derived from the Apostles, that is, the testimony of those who lived either in the Apostles' age, or so near to it, that they could not easily be imposed upon in this case, and made to believe that to be of Apostolical tradition which really was not so, that is to say, about the time of the Council of Nice, about two hundred years after the Apostolical age. And we may also believe the testimony of those who lived in the century following that Council, since in that time they could not be deceived in the tradition of what was acknowledged at the time of that Council to be Apostolical. But there

is no better rule for the judging concerning the authority of tradition, than that which is given by Vincentius Lirinensis in the beginning of his Common.tory.—§ ix. pp. 35—42.

*Ibid.—Introduction to the Independency of the Church.*

If any other matters not yet received or practised in our Church, should be found to be of equal Antiquity and Universality, I declare it to be my hearty desire that they also may be restored : for I am well assured, that from the beginning of the Gospel of Christ to the time of the Council of Nice, and long after during the fourth century, the Catholic Church all over the world was united in one holy doctrine, discipline, and manner of worship.—The practice of the Church therefore at the time of the Council of Nice is certainly best fitted to be the standard for every reformation of the Church.—Since then we have seen and experienced the folly of deviating so far from the Primitive plan to gain those who cannot be gained by any thing but the utter extirpation of Episcopacy and Liturgy, and all that is not according to their own novel fancies, why should we not entirely restore our Liturgy to the Primitive standard, and revive those usages,—by returning to which we shall plainly lead the van for the introduction of Catholic unity into the Church of Christ. For we shall then want nothing (as we now most certainly do) that is agreeable to the practice of the Primitive Church, when a Catholic uniformity was universally preserved.—The only means to remove this disunion, is by every Church returning to a closer union with the Primitive Church in doctrine, discipline, and worship : for as the church never was so strictly and firmly united as in the Primitive times, and particularly about the time when the Council of Nice was celebrated :—so if ever the Church be as firmly united again, it must be upon the same principles, and practices. The Church never was united but upon the principles and usages which obtained at the time of the Nicene Council : and we have therefore good reason to believe that it never can be united but upon those principles and usages. That Church then, which shall first restore all those principles and

usages, may be justly said to lead the way to Catholic Union.—  
p. 7—10.

HICKS, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Sermons*, No. 3.

But if any modern writer who is of yesterday, will otherwise interpret these words upon his own head, I will reply unto him what our late blessed Sovereign, the Martyr for the Apostolical Government, said unto Mr. Henderson in his second paper, “If the practice of the primitive Church (saith he) and the universal consent of the Fathers be not a convincing argument, when the interpretation of Scripture is doubtful, I know nothing.” And elsewhere; “Although I never esteemed any argument equal to the Scriptures, yet I do think the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the universal practice of the primitive Church to be the best, and most authentical interpreters of God’s word; and consequently the fittest judges between me and you, till you find me a better.” According to what St. Augustin said of Infant Baptism, but may with much more reason be said of Episcopal Government, that which the Universal Church doth hold, and was never instituted by Councils, but hath always been retained in the Church, we most justly believe to have descended from no authority but the Apostles’.—Vol. iii. p. 82.

COLLIER, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Vindication of the reasons and defence.*

I desire to know, what authority any particular society of Christians of the sixteenth century had to desert from the custom of the Universal Church, from early and more enlightened ages, and which, as our author observes, were better *guides, as being much nearer the fountain’s head*, than those so long behind them. And if they had no good warrant for stepping out of the old paths, the fences of a modern constitution signify little.—That this was the practice of the Universal Church, St. Augustin is clear and decisive. And since nothing but *certain evidence* will satisfy our author, here he has it. Here is the attestation of all

Christendom. Here is number, weight, and authority, with a witness ; and is not the practice of the Universal Church a good ground for reliance ? What ? Not in those early and unblemished ages ? In those happy times when learning, and piety, and right belief had so visible an ascendant ?—It was a maxim with Luther and his adherents, to resign to nothing but a text of Scripture, of which themselves were to be the expositors. The Bible was GOD's, but the comment was their own ; as for Antiquity, they had no regard for it. Calvin likewise was much of the same mind. He gives no deference to Antiquity, and seems to confine the rule of worship to express declarations of Scripture. These men, though they discovered some errors, fell into others. Particularly Calvin and his followers held some principles very destructive of the public peace.—Knox rails upon the Emperor and our Queen Mary.—Part 2. pp. 72. 81. 164—166.

LESLIE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Letter to a Gentleman converted from Deism.*

But there is an infallibility in the Church, not personal in any one or all of Christians put together ; for millions of fallibles can never make an infallible. But the infallibility consists in the nature of the evidence, which having all the four marks mentioned in the short method of the Deists, cannot possibly be false. As you and I believe there is such a town as Constantinople, that there was such a man as Henry VIII. as much as if we had seen them with our eyes : not from the credit of any historian or traveller, all of whom are fallible ; but from the nature of the evidence, wherein it is impossible for men to have conspired and carried it on without contradiction if it were false.

Thus, whatever doctrine has been taught in the Church, (according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis,) *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, is the Christian doctrine ; for in this case, such doctrine is a fact, and having the foresaid marks must be a true fact, *viz.* that such doctrine was so taught and received.

This was the method taken in the Council called at Alexandria against Arius ; it was asked by Alexander, the Archbishop who

presided, *Quis unquam talia audit?* who ever heard of this doctrine before? And it being answered by all the Bishops there assembled in the negative, it was concluded a novel doctrine, and contrary to what had been universally received in the Christian Church. Thus every doctrine may be reduced to fact; for it is purely fact, whether such doctrine was received or not?

And a council assembled upon such an occasion stands as evidence of the fact, not as judges of the faith: which they cannot alter by their votes or authority.

A council has authority in matters of discipline in the Church; but in matters of faith, what is called their authority, is their attestation to the truth of fact; which if it has the marks before mentioned, must be infallibly true: not from the infallibility of any or all of the persons, but from the nature of the evidence, as before is said.

And this is the surest rule whereby to judge of doctrines, and to know what the Catholic Church had believed and taught, as received from the Apostles.

And they who refuse to be tried by this rule, who say we care not what was believed by the Catholic Church, either in former ages or now, we think our own interpretation or criticisms upon such a text of as great authority as theirs; these are justly to be suspected, nay it is evident that they are broaching some novel doctrines which cannot stand this test. Besides the monstrous arrogance in such a pretence, these overthrow the foundation of that sure and infallible evidence upon which Christianity itself does stand, and reduce all to a blind enthusiasm.—*Works*, vol. i. p. 70.

*Ibid.*—*Dissertation concerning Ecclesiastical History.*

In Ecclesiastical History, and there only, I may say, is the decision of all controverted points in Divinity, either as to doctrine or discipline. For every one of them must be determined by matter of fact. It is not refining, and criticisms, and our notions of things, but what that faith was, which at first was delivered to the Saints. This is matter of fact, and must be de-

terminated by evidence. And where any text of the New Testament is disputed, the best evidence is from those Fathers of the Church, who lived in the Apostolical age, and learned the faith from the mouths of the Apostles themselves, such as St. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c. These must know the best sense and meaning of the words delivered by the Apostles. And next to them, they to whom they did deliver the same, and so on through the several ages of the Church to this day. And those doctrines and that government of the Church, which has this evidence, must be the truth. And they who refuse to be determined by this rule, are justly to be suspected, nay, they give evidence against themselves, that they are departed from the truth.—p. 411.

WATERLAND, PRESBYTER.—*Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.*

It is not at all likely, that any whole Church of those early times should vary from Apostolical Doctrine in things of moment: but it is, morally speaking, absurd to imagine that all the Churches should combine in the same error, and conspire together to corrupt the doctrine of Christ. This is the argument which Irenæus and Tertullian insist much upon, and triumph in over the heretics of their times: and it is obliquely glanced upon by Hegesippus and Clemens Alexandrinus of the same second century, and by Origen also of the third. The argument was undoubtedly true and just as it then stood, while there were no breaks in the succession of doctrine, but a perfect unanimity of the Churches all along, in the prime articles: though, afterwards, the force of this argument came to be obscured, and almost lost, by taking in things foreign to it, and blending it with what happened in later times. The force of it could last no longer than such unanimity lasted. I say, while the Churches were all unanimous in the main things, (as they were in Irenæus's time and Tertullian's and for more than a century after,) that very unanimity was a presumptive argument that their faith was right, derived down to them from the Apostles themselves. For it was highly unreasonable to suppose, that those several Churches,

very distant from each other in place, and of different languages, and under no common visible head, should all unite in the same errors, and deviate uniformly from their rule at once. But that they should all agree in the same common faith, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same common cause, which could be no other but the common delivery of the same uniform faith and doctrine to all the Churches by the Apostles themselves. Such unanimity could never come by chance, but must be derived from one common source: and therefore the harmony of their doctrine was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it. As to the fact, that the Churches were thus unanimous in all the prime things, in those days, Irenæus, who was a very knowing person, and who had come far east to settle in the west, bears ample testimony to it. Tertullian, in the two passages last cited from him, testifies the same thing, as to the unanimity of the Churches of those times in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine. Hegesippus, contemporary with Irenæus, gives much the same account of the succession of true doctrine, down to his own time, in the several Churches. Clemens of Alexandria means the same thing, where he recommends the faith of the Universal Church as *one*, and as more ancient than heresies. And Origen, of the third century, testifies the same of the Church in his time, and argues in the same manner from it. Irenæus and Tertullian were both of them so strongly persuaded of the certainty, first of the fact, and next of the inference from it, that they scrupled not to urge it as a very full and convincing proof of the Apostolical faith singly considered, and abstracting from Scripture proof; an argument which there is no need to be jealous of, if it be but rightly understood, and limited to such circumstances as it was grounded upon. For the meaning was not, that Apostolical Churches could never err, nor that tradition would be always a safe rule to go by: but such tradition as that was, which might easily be traced up to the Apostles, by the help of writings then extant, (as easily as we may now trace up the doctrine of our Church to the reign of Charles, or of James the First,) such a tradition might be depended upon. Besides that the unanimity of the Churches all the world over (which

could not be rationally accounted for on any other supposition but that they had been so taught from the beginning) confirmed the same thing. The argument in this light, and in those circumstances, was a very good one. But when those circumstances came to be altered, and there had been several breaks in the succession of doctrine, and that too even in the Apostolical Churches, then there could be no arguing in the same precise way as before : only thus far they might argue in after times (upon a supposition that their faith could be proved to be the same as in the former ages), that since their doctrine was still that very doctrine which the Churches held while they were unanimous and had admitted no breaks, therefore it is such as was from the beginning in the Church of Christ. In this manner we can reason even at this day, and can thereby make Irenæus's or Tertullian's argument our own : provided we have first proved that the faith we contend for is the very same that obtained in the Churches of that age.....

It has been objected, that our sixth Article condemns the method of interpreting Scripture by antiquity, or at least supercedes it ; because it says, " Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or necessary to salvation." The article says nothing but what is perfectly right, and perfectly consistent with all we have been pleading for. We allow no doctrine as necessary, which stands only on Fathers, or on tradition, oral or written ; we admit none for such, but what is contained in Scripture, and proved by Scripture, rightly interpreted. And we know of no way more safe in necessities to preserve the right interpretation, than to take the ancients along with us. We think it a good method to secure our rule of faith, against impostures of all kinds ; whether of enthusiasm or false criticism, or conceited reason, or oral tradition, or the assuming dictates of an infallible chair. If we thus preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture only ; for the sense of Scripture is Scripture. Suppose a man were to prove his legal title to an estate ;

he appeals to the laws ; the true sense and meaning of the laws must be proved by the best rules of interpretation ; but, after all, it is the law that gives the title, and that only. In like manner after using all proper means to come at the sense of Scripture, (which is Scripture,) it is that, and that only, which we ground our faith upon, and prove our faith by. We allege not Fathers as grounds, or principles, or foundations of our faith, but as witnesses, and as interpreters, and faithful conveyers.

That the Church of England has a very particular regard to antiquity, may sufficiently appear from a canon set forth in the same year when our Articles were first perfected and authorized by Act of Parliament, namely, in the year 1571. By that canon it is provided, “that preachers shall not presume to deliver any thing from the pulpit, as of moment, to be religiously observed and believed by the people, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament and collected out of the same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and the Bishops of the ancient Church.” A wise regulation, formed with exquisite judgment, and worded with the exactest caution. The Canon does not order, that they shall teach whatever had been taught by Fathers ; no, that would have been setting up a new rule of faith ; neither does it say that they shall teach whatsoever the Fathers had collected from Scripture ; no, that would have been making them infallible interpreters, or infallible reasoners : the doctrine must be found first in Scripture : only to be the more secure that we have found it there, the Fathers are to be called in, to be, as it were, constant checks upon the presumption or wantonness of private interpretation ; but then again as to private interpretation, there is liberty enough allowed to it. Preachers are not forbidden to interpret this or that text, or hundreds of texts, differently from what the Fathers have done ; provided still they keep within the analogy of faith, and presume not to raise any new doctrine : neither are they altogether restrained from teaching any thing new, provided it be offered as opinion only, or an inferior truth, and not pressed as necessary upon the people. For it was thought that there could be no necessary article of faith or doctrine now drawn from Scripture, but what the ancients had drawn out before, from the same Scripture : to say

otherwise, would imply that the ancients had failed universally in necessities, which is morally absurd.

From this account it may appear, that the Church of England is exactly in the same sentiments which I have been pleading for. And indeed, if there be any Church now in the world, which truly reverences antiquity, and pays a proper regard to it, it is this Church. The Romanists talk of Antiquity, while we observe and follow it.—*Works*, vol. v. p. 265, 316.

BINGHAM, PRESBYTER.—*Antiquities of the Christian Church*.

If it be now inquired what articles of Faith, and what points of practice were reckoned thus fundamental, or essential to the very being of a Christian, and the union of many Christians into one body or Church, the Ancients are very plain in resolving this. For as to Fundamental Articles of Faith, the Church had them always collected or summed up out of Scripture in her Creeds, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church by baptism ; and consequently both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of Faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of Believers. Upon this account, as I have had occasion to shew in a former book, the Creed was commonly called by the ancients the *κάρων*, and *Regula Fidei*, because it was the known standard or Rule of Faith, by which Orthodoxy and Heresy were judged and examined. If a man adhered to this rule he was deemed an Orthodox Christian, and in the union of the Catholic Faith ; but if he deviated from it in any point, he was esteemed as one that cut himself off, and separated from the communion of the Church, by entertaining heretical opinions and deserting the common Faith. Thus the Fathers in the Council of Antioch charge Paulus Samosatensis with departing from the Rule of Canon, meaning the Creed, the Rule of Faith, because he denied the Divinity of CHRIST. Irenæus calls it the unalterable Canon or Rule of Faith, and says, This Faith was the same in all the world ; men professed it with one heart and one soul : for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the

power of Faith was one and the same. The Churches in Germany had no other Faith or tradition than those in Spain, or in France, or in the East, or Egypt, or Libya. Nor did the most eloquent ruler of the Church say any more than this, for no one was above his master, nor the weakest diminish any thing of this tradition. For the Faith being one and the same, he that said most of it could not enlarge it, nor he that said least, take any thing from it. So Tertullian says, There is one Rule of Faith only, which admits of no change or alteration, ‘ That which teaches us to believe in one GOD ALMIGHTY, the Maker of the world, and in JESUS CHRIST HIS SON, &c.’ This Rule, he says, was instituted by CHRIST Himself, and there were no disputes in the Church about it, but such as Heretics brought in, or such as made Heretics; to know nothing beyond this, was to know all things. This Faith was the Rule of believing from the beginning of the Gospel, and the antiquity of it was sufficiently demonstrated by the novelty of heresies, which were but of yesterday’s standing in comparison of it. Cyprian says, It was the law which the whole Catholic Church held, and that the Novatians themselves baptized into the same Creed, though they differed about the sense of the Article relating to the Church. Therefore Novatian in his book of the Trinity makes no scruple to give the Creed the same name, *Regula Veritatis*, the Rule of Truth. And St. Jerome after the same manner, disputing against the errors of the Montanists, says, The first thing they differed about was the Rule of Faith. For the Church believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be each distinct in his own Person, though united in substance. But the Montanists, following the doctrine of Sabellius, contracted the Trinity into one Person. From all which it is evident, that the fundamental Articles of Faith were those which the Primitive Church summed up in her Creeds, in the profession of which she admitted men as members into the unity of her Body by baptism; and if any deserted or corrupted this Faith, they were no longer reputed Christians, but Heretics, who break the unity of the Church by breaking the unity of the Faith, though they had otherwise made no farther separation from her Communion. For as Clemens Alexandrinus says, out

of Hermes Pastor, Faith is the virtue that binds and unites the Church together. Whence Hegesippus, the ancient historian, giving an account of the old Heretics, says, They divided the unity of the Church by pernicious speeches against God and His CHRIST; that is, by denying some of the prime, fundamental Articles of Faith. He that makes a breach upon any one of these, cannot maintain the unity of the Church, nor his own character as a Christian. We ought therefore, says Cyprian, in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church, and not to yield in any thing to the enemies of Faith and Truth. For he cannot be thought a Christian who continues not in the truth of CHRIST'S Gospel and Faith. If men be Heretics, says Tertullian, they cannot be Christians. The like is said by Lactantius, and Jerome, and Athanasius, and Hilary, and many others of the ancients, whose sense upon this matter I have fully represented in another place. As, therefore, there was an unity of Faith necessary to be maintained in certain fundamental Articles, in order to make a man a Christian, so these Articles were always to be found in the Church's Creeds; the profession of which was esteemed keeping the unity of the Faith; and deviating in any point from them, was esteemed a breach of that one Faith, and a virtual departing from the unity of the Church.—

We are next to examine what communion different Churches held with one another, that we may discover the harmonious unity of the Catholic Church. And here first of all we are to observe, that as there was one common Faith, consisting of certain fundamental Articles, essential to the very being of a particular Church and its unity, and the being of a Christian; so this same Faith was necessary to unite the different parts of the Catholic Church, and make them one body of Christians. So that if any Church deserted or destroyed this Faith in whole or in part, they were looked upon as rebels and traitors against CHRIST, and enemies to the common Faith, and treated as a conventicle of Heretics, and not of Christians. Upon this account every Bishop not only made a declaration of his Faith at his ordination, before the Provincial Synod that ordained him, but also sent his circular or encyclical letters, as they were called,

to foreign Churches, to signify that he was in communion with them. And this was so necessary a thing in a Bishop newly ordained, that Liberatus tells us, the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon himself or them.

To maintain this unity of Faith entire, every Church was ready to give each other their mutual assistance to oppose all fundamental errors, and beat down heresy at its first appearance among them. The whole world in this respect was but one common Diocese, the Episcopate was an universal thing, and every Bishop had his share in it in such a manner as to have an equal concern in the whole; as I have more fully showed in another place, where I observed, that in things not appertaining to the Faith, Bishops were not to meddle with other men's Dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own: but when the Faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule, of there being but one Episcopacy, every other Bishopric was as much their Diocese as their own; and no human Laws or Canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of the Episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of Faith and Religion. This was the ground of their meeting in Synods, Provincial, National, and sending their joint opinions and advice from one Church to another. The greatest part of Church History is made up of such acts as these, so that it were next to impertinent to refer to any particulars. I only observe one thing farther upon this head, that the intermeddling with other men's concerns, which would have been accounted a real breach of unity in many other cases, was in this case thought so necessary, that there was no certain way to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church and Faith without it. And as an instance of this, I have noted in the fore-cited book, that though it was against the ordinary rule of the Church for any Bishop to ordain in another man's Diocese, yet in case a Bishop turned Heretic, and persecuted the Orthodox, and would ordain none but heretical men to establish Heresy in his Diocese, in that case

any Orthodox Bishop was not only authorised, but obliged, as opportunity served, and the needs of the Church required, to ordain Catholic teachers in such a Diocese, to oppose the malignant designs of the enemy, and stop the growth of Heresy, which might otherwise take deep root, and spread and overrun the Church. Thus Athanasius and the famous Eusebius of Samosata went about the world in the prevalency of the Arian heresy, ordaining in every Church where they came, such clergy as were necessary to support the Orthodox cause in such a time of distress and desolation; and this was so far from being reckoned a breach of the Church's unity, though against the letter of a Canon in ordinary cases, that it was necessary to be done, in such a state of affairs, to maintain the unity of the Catholic Faith, which every Bishop was obliged to defend, not only in his own Diocese, but in all parts of the world, by virtue of that rule which obliges Bishops in weighty affairs to take care of the Catholic Church, and requires all Churches in time of danger to give mutual aid and assistance to one another.—Vol. ii. pp. 2, 14.

#### JEBB, BISHOP.

But you will feel with me, that it is something in favour of Vincentius's rule, that it has been received, extolled, and acted upon, by such men as Ridley, Jewel, Grotius, Overall, Hammond, Beveridge, Bull, Hickes, Bramhall, Grabe, Cave, and our own Archbishop King; that it has been admitted expressly even by Chillingworth; and that it has been unreservedly acknowledged as a just and true guide by Bishop Taylor, in one of his latest works, his visitation sermon at Connor; a tribute, this last, the more remarkable, because, in his 'Liberty of Prophesying,' and in his 'Ductor Dubitantium,' he had spoken less respectfully of the principle; and his remarkable change of language can be accounted for only by his having undergone a correspondent change of sentiment. He had seen, felt, and weighed every difficulty; the result of all was, a deliberate persuasion, that Vincentius was right, and that he himself had been wrong. But, to say no

more of mere authorities, however strong, I own I cannot at present feel any difficulty in applying Vincentius's rule. If a doctrine is propounded to me, as vitally essential, that is, to speak technically, as matter of Faith, before I can receive it as such, I must go to the Catholic succession, and ascertain whether that doctrine has been held *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*: convinced, if it has not been so held, my assent is not due to it as a matter of Faith. If, again, a doctrine which I hold, is impugned as Heretical, next to the Scripture, and as interpretative of Scripture, I must go to the Catholic succession; and if I find this doctrine universally asserted, I cannot believe that it is any other than the sincere truth of the Gospel. The universality here mentioned, is not, of course, a mathematical, but a moral universality: the universality, to use Vincentius's own words, of those "*Qui in fide et communione Catholicâ, sancte, sapienter, et constanter viventes, vel mori in Christo fideliter, vel occidi pro Christo feliciter meruerint.*" And here, I may observe, that Vincentius himself has anticipated your great objection; a very fair one, no doubt, and which requires, and deserves an answer;—namely, 'that true Christianity, far from being diffused *ubique*, or received *ab omnibus*, was sometimes confined to a very narrow channel: when the great majority of the Bishops were Arians, what becomes of the rule?' Let Vincentius answer, *Quid si novella aliqua contagio, non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur. Tunc item providebit ut Antiquitati inhaereat.* Nor be it thought, that by this means, the *quod ubique*, and *quod ab omnibus*, are idly absorbed in the *quod semper*: they are, as above hinted, to be taken, not mathematically, but morally; and, so taken, they are an effectual guard to the *quod semper*. From the beginning, or, at least, from very remote antiquity, worthy individuals have frequently held, some one or more, unsound opinions; and looking to individuals merely, the *quod semper* might be alleged, as it has been alleged, in favour of every opinion: it is to be rectified, however, by looking to universality and consent: not universality without exception—for such is not to be found: but the concurrent, and consistent sentiments, of the

most, and greatest, doctors, in the whole body of the Church : not at any given period, but throughout the whole succession. Nor will such a research be so laborious as might be imagined ; for, in the first place, the Catholic verities, those to be believed for necessity of salvation, are but few ; and in the next place, the concurrent sense of Catholic Christians, on those few, but important points, has been amply elicited by controversy ; inso-much that, from the works of Bishop Bull, and a very few more, any candid and intelligent student might obtain competent and intelligent satisfaction, respecting the sense of the universal Church, on any and every of the Catholic verities. As to all other verities, and as to the interpretation of particular texts of Scripture, they are left at large, provided always that no Catholic truth be impugned, and that the analogy of the Faith be maintained inviolable.—*Life*, vol. ii. pp. 249—252.

VAN MILDERT, BISHOP.—*Bampton Lectures.*

Much discussion has from time to time arisen respecting the deference due to the writings of the Primitive Fathers of the Church, and the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity ; points of considerable moment, and deserving of attentive examination.

It seems to be indisputable, that the Primitive Fathers are not to be regarded as Divinely inspired, since otherwise their writings would necessarily have formed a part of the Sacred Canon. The question, therefore, is, whether, admitting them to have no more than human authority, they have any special claim to our reverential regard, which places them on higher ground than that of their ecclesiastical successors. And this question is to be determined by a fair consideration of any peculiar advantages they might possess, and of their ability and disposition to turn them to good account.

Against any such deference being had to these our spiritual forefathers, it has been sometimes contended, that their writings now extant are few in number ; that several of them, if not spurious, are adulterated, through the pious frauds, the sinister designs, or the ignorance of after ages : that their style and reasoning are

obscure ; that in their zeal to defeat opponents, they occasionally suppress or disguise the truth ; that they are on certain points inconsistent with each other, and with themselves ; and that it is often difficult to ascertain whether the opinions they advance are meant to be declaratory of the judgment of the Church, or delivered only as their own private interpretations. For these and similar reasons it has been alleged, that their testimony as genuine witnesses of the Faith may deservedly be impeached ; and that neither Protestants nor Papists have hesitated occasionally to depart from their authority.

But of these charges it has repeatedly been shown, that many are greatly exaggerated ; some wholly unfounded ; while others affect not their writings, more than the writings of almost all controversial authors of ancient date, adverting (as they must necessarily do) to times and persons, and local circumstances, now but imperfectly known, and which cast a shade of obscurity over some of their narratives and their reasonings. These afford no good argument for laying their productions under a general interdict. Against an implicit submission to their authority, they are, doubtless, important considerations : but against the use and application of them as documents of more than ordinary value, they merit but little attention.

In answer, therefore, to such objections, it may suffice to observe, that supposing the Primitive Fathers to have been men of only common discernment and integrity, their testimony respecting the doctrines then actually received by the Church, and maintained against the heresies then prevailing, must have peculiar weight. Those among them who had been personally conversant with the Apostles, and who derived their knowledge of the Christian Faith from what they continually heard of their preaching and discourse, as well as from their writings, seem to have claim to a regard only short of that which was due to their inspired preceptors. To place such men as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, no higher in the scale of authority, with respect to the value of their testimony on these points, than Bishops and Pastors in later times, betrays an error of judgment which on any other subject of investigation analogous to this, would be

deemed preposterous. On the part of their immediate successors, somewhat of the same extraordinary claim to acceptance still presents itself, though with a certain diminution of its force. Descending still lower in the scale of history, this authority rapidly diminishes, and our judgment in their favour will be chiefly, if not solely, influenced, by the internal evidence their writings afford of some superior qualifications in the authors themselves. Yet, until the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, and the full establishment of the Papal usurpation, the Fathers of the Church appear to have been deeply sensible of the obligation laid upon them to "contend for the Faith once delivered to the saints," and to guard the sacred deposit committed to their charge against every vain imagination which the Heretic or Schismatic might labour to introduce.

Disclaiming, therefore, any superstitious reverence towards these venerable men, it may reasonably be urged, that their peculiarly advantageous circumstances demand especial consideration; and that unless their characters, both moral and intellectual, could be so successfully impeached as to prove them wholly unworthy of credit, their testimony is of the very first importance in ascertaining the Primitive Faith. In matters requisite to the formation of the Church; in framing Confessions of Faith, more or less explicit according to the errors it was necessary to discountenance; and in adopting means for the perpetuation of these benefits to the latest ages; they appear as having been at first deputed by the Apostles for purposes the most important, and as acting under impressions of a most awful responsibility. To them were also confided those Sacred Oracles on which our Faith now most essentially depends. Through their ministry we have received these invaluable treasures; to their zeal and fidelity, under Providence, we owe the transmission of the pure word of God to these present times: and the charge thus consigned to our care, we are bound to deliver unimpaired to succeeding generations.

If, in addition to these special grounds of confidence in the early Fathers, we admit what has been contended for by learned and judicious Divines, that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit,

(especially that of “discerning of Spirits,”) were not entirely withdrawn from the Church till long after the time of the Apostles ; this would give still stronger confirmation to their claims. For though we should not be warranted in a supposition that even these extraordinary gifts conferred authority for promulgating new articles of Faith, or infringing on any exclusive prerogative of the Sacred writers, yet it would go far towards establishing interpretations of Christian Doctrine thus received and sanctioned, on a firmer basis than any on which their less gifted successors can ground their pretensions.

But, not to insist on any disputable points, the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity in general, and of its earliest productions in particular, is sufficiently evident, upon the ordinary principles of criticism and evidence. As works so nearly contemporary with those of the Sacred Canons, they illustrate the diction and phraseology of the inspired Penmen ; they give an insight into the history of the age in which the writings of the New Testament were composed ; they explain allusions to rites and customs, which otherwise might be involved in much obscurity ; and, what is of still more importance, they assist in fixing the sense of controverted texts of Scripture, by the substantial evidence they afford of their generally received interpretation in the primitive ages of the Church. These advantages are derived to us from the public acts of the Church recorded in the most ancient ecclesiastical histories ; from the prescribed formularies of Faith then in general use : and from the censures authoritatively passed upon such as departed from these standards of reputed orthodoxy. Hence we are assured of the care and solicitude manifested from the beginning by spiritual rulers, to preserve the truth from corruption : and when the importance of the doctrines themselves, as well as the opportunities they enjoyed of tracing them to the fountain head, are duly considered ; it can hardly be conceived, that they who had the guidance and government of the Primitive Church, should either be universally uninformed as to any fundamental truth, or universally embrace any fundamental error.

It is, therefore, with no common reverence that these authori-

ties are to be regarded ; nor can we detract from their just pretensions without hazard to some of the main foundations of our Faith. “ No man ” says Bishop Bull, “ can oppose Catholic consent, but he will at last be found to oppose both the Divine Oracles and sound reason.” Nevertheless, we do not claim for them any infallibility, any commission to make further revelations of the Divine will, or any absolute authority as Scripture interpreters. The appeal still lies from them, as from all other religious instructors, to that Word itself, which was no less their Rule of Faith than it is ours : and the highest degree of deference that can be due to them, may be paid without any infringement of that inviolable maxim, “ If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.”—*Sermon v. p. 94.*

OXFORD.

*The Feast of the Purification.*

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

*On the particular subject of this Catena, may be profitably consulted,*

Laud's Conference with Fisher.

Thorndike de ratione ac jure finiendi controversias Ecclesiæ.

Patrick on Tradition.

Brett on Tradition.

Waterland on the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.

Allix—Judgment of the Jewish Church.

*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts.—*

Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*

Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake and Varty.*

Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*

Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*

Newman's Sermons. 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*

Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*

The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*

Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan*.  
 Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns*.  
 Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
 Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Law's first and second Letters to Hoadley.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Bp. Andrews's Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering*.  
 Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.  
 Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Le Bas's Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons*.  
 Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.  
 Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons*.

*Larger Works which may be profitably studied.*

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
 Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.  
 Waterland's Works.—*Do*.  
 Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.  
 Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.  
 Leslie's Works.—*Do*.  
 Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.  
 Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.  
 Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do*.

---

*In the Press,*

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, No. 79, ON PURGATORY.

---

*These Tracts are sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,  
 ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.  
 1837.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.







UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL

MAY 7 1984  
MAY 24 1984

REC'D LD-URL

AUG 08 1988  
ILL CUT  
SEP 21 1988

NON-RENEWABLE

REC'D LD-URL

SEP 10 1990

NOV 08 1991

DUE 2 WKS FROM DATE RECEIVED

ILL/NEH



3 1158 00927 9141

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 629 742 8

